

by our public relations officials and the public, insofar as military security permits.

5. Close integration of our land, sea, and air forces has been accomplished in most theaters and works extremely well. It points the way toward a sound post-war military policy. Our military effort is well coordinated with that of our allies in the areas visited.

6. The United States has constructed huge airfields all over the world at tremendous cost to our people. The use of some of these fields in the future may be just as essential to our security as battleships or divisions. We have no post-war rights of access to these fields outside the Western Hemisphere at the present time. These rights of access are also indispensable to the vitally important growth of commercial aviation.

7. The need for parity in international communications is stressed in every theater. Equality in these cable and wireless communications would seem to be a fitting subject for consideration and possible reverse lend-lease.

8. A policy of relieving men overseas after they have served a certain length of time would be in the interest of efficiency as well as conducive to physical and mental welfare. The committee is aware of the shipping problems which have created this situation. It believes that the shipping situation is now improving. A definite promise to a man that after a certain length of time he will be replaced is a big morale factor.

9. The need of a clear national policy is strikingly apparent. With such a policy should go an American representation abroad in which our military, diplomatic, and business personnel work as a team, with appropriate international rank. We owe this to ourselves and to the world.

10. The committee returns inspired by the bravery of our American fighting men and impressed with the obstacles which they have overcome. They are the products of a free system of government, and their sacrifices are a justification of our democratic way of life. Their courage should inspire us to leave no stone unturned to be worthy of their sacrifice.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL.
JAMES M. MEAD.
ALBERT B. CHANDLER.
HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
RALPH O. BREWSTER.

MODERN EXPLORERS AND PIONEERS— ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Modern Explorers and Pioneers," delivered by him on Thursday, October 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

After 5 hours and 6 minutes spent deliberating with closed doors, on motion of Mr. BARKLEY, the Senate, as in open legislative session, adjourned (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) to Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, strong to save, in these tragic days of strife, commercial greed, and social prejudice, forbid that the sanctities of responsibility and cooperation should be corroded. Shield us from

all threatening elements of modern life which are a menace to home, to free institutions, and to a commanding democracy. We need Thee, O Christ, as a moral goal and impulse; for Thou alone art the hope of men and for the liberation of humanity.

Almighty God, as our country is destined to some tremendous undertaking and the call is fiercely in earnest, we pray that all hindrances may be removed. Free it from every type of volcanic patriotism; we pray that we may be devout, industrious and sincere, meeting every challenge in the spirit of Jesus of Nazareth; O help us to reassert His code, once ridiculed and evaded. As Thy servants, heavenly Father, help us to remember that each is but a unit in our great human family, bound together by ties so delicately adjusted, that what helps one helps all and what hurts one hurts all; O let all differences dwindle into harmless and forgettable proportions and may we quietly enter into the realm of a larger and clearer service. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 7, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3291. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

CREDITS AGAINST THE VICTORY TAX

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of H. R. 3381, relating to credits against the Victory tax, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 453 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the credit against the Victory tax) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 453. Credits Against Victory Tax.

"(a) Allowance of credit: There shall be allowed as a credit against the Victory tax for each taxable year—

"(1) Single persons: In the case of a single person, a married person not living with husband or wife, or an estate or trust, an amount equal to 25 percent of the Victory tax of \$500, whichever is the lesser.

"(2) Heads of families: In the case of the head of a family, an amount equal to 40 percent of the Victory tax or \$1,000, whichever is the lesser.

"(3) Married persons: In the case of a married person living with husband or wife—

"(A) if separate returns are filed by each spouse an amount equal to 40 percent of the Victory tax or \$500, whichever is the lesser, or

"(B) if a separate return is filed by one spouse and no return is filed by the other spouse, or if a joint return is filed under section 51 (b), only one credit not exceeding 40 percent of the Victory tax or \$1,000, whichever is the lesser.

"(4) Dependents: For each dependent specified in section 25 (b), excluding as a dependent, in the case of a head of a family, one who would be excluded under section 25 (b) (2) (B), an amount equal to 2 percent of the Victory tax or \$100, whichever is the lesser.

"(b) Change of status: If for any taxable year the status of the taxpayer (other than a taxpayer who makes his return and pays his tax under Supplement T) with respect to his marital relationship or with respect to his dependents, changed during the taxable year, the amount of the credit provided by this section for such taxable year shall be apportioned, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, in accordance with the number of months before and after such change. For the purpose of such apportionment a fractional part of a month shall be disregarded unless it amounts to more than half a month in which case it shall be considered as a month.

"(c) Status of Supplement T taxpayer: If for any taxable year a taxpayer makes his return and pays his tax under Supplement T, for the purpose of the credit provided by this section, his status for such year with respect to his marital relationship or with respect to his dependents shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 401."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 454 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the post-war credit of Victory tax) is hereby repealed.

(b) Section 34 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out "sections 453 and 454" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 453."

(c) Section 456 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the 90-percent limit on the tax imposed by chapter 1) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 456. Limitation on Tax.

"The tax imposed by section 450 (Victory tax), computed without regard to the credits provided in sections 453 and 466 (e), shall not exceed the excess of 90 percent of the net income of the taxpayer for the taxable year over the tax imposed by this chapter, computed without regard to section 450 and without regard to the credits provided in sections 31, 32, 35, and 466 (e)."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TIME FOR FILING APPLICATIONS FOR RELIEF OF EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3363) extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 722 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code (prescribing the time for filing applications for general relief under the excess-profits tax) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Application for relief under this section: The taxpayer shall compute its tax,

file its return, and pay the tax shown on its return under this subchapter without the application of this section, except as provided in section 710 (a) (5). The benefits of this section shall not be allowed unless the taxpayer within the period of time prescribed by section 322 and subject to the limitation as to amount of credit or refund prescribed in such section makes application therefor in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. If a constructive average base period net income has been determined under the provisions of this section for any taxable year, the Commissioner may, by regulations approved by the Secretary, prescribe the extent to which the limitations prescribed by this subsection may be waived for the purpose of determining the tax under this subchapter for a subsequent taxable year."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1939.

INTEREST

Sec. 2. (a) Deficiencies: Section 292 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended (1) by inserting immediately before the first paragraph the following: "(a) General Rule.—" and (2) by inserting at the end of such section the following:

"(b) Deficiency resulting from relief under section 722: If any part of a deficiency for a taxable year is determined by the Commissioner to be attributable to the final determination of an application for relief or benefit under section 722 for any taxable year beginning prior to January 1, 1942, no interest shall be assessed or paid with respect to such part of the deficiency; and for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1941, no interest shall be assessed or paid with respect to such part of the deficiency for any period prior to 1 year after the filing of the application for relief under section 722, or September 16, 1945, whichever is the later."

(b) Overpayments: Section 3771 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(g) Claims based upon relief under section 722: If any part of an overpayment for a taxable year is determined by the Commissioner to be attributable to the final determination of an application for relief or benefit under section 722 for any taxable year beginning prior to January 1, 1942, no interest shall be allowed or paid with respect to such part of the overpayment; and for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1941, no interest shall be allowed or paid with respect to such part of the overpayment for any period prior to 1 year after the filing of the application for relief under section 722, or September 16, 1945, whichever is the later."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman please explain the purpose of the bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The purpose of H. R. 3363 is to extend the time within which applications for relief under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code may be filed.

Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Revenue Act of 1942, provides that where the taxpayer can establish that his excess-profits-tax credit causes an excessive and discriminatory tax because of some unusual condition in his business he may apply for relief.

The original period within which his application for relief was required to

have been made was 6 months after the date of enactment of the Revenue Act of 1942. This 6 months' period expired on April 21, 1943, but was subsequently extended to September 15, 1943.

It has now developed that this extended period of time is too short to allow taxpayers to properly prepare their applications and compile the detailed supporting data. Consequently it is proposed by this legislation to make the period within which such applications must be filed the same as that now applicable to claims for refunds. In general this period of time will be 3 years from the time the tax return was filed or 2 years from the time the tax was paid, whichever is later.

The existing law requires that the Federal Government pay 6-percent interest on all refunds made to the taxpayer and that it collect 6-percent interest on all deficiencies paid to the Government; the interest to begin running from the date the overpayment was made in the case of a refund, and from the date the tax should have been paid in the case of a deficiency.

Since section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code is for the relief of the taxpayer, and since it was made retroactive from the date of its enactment in October 1942 to the years 1940 and 1941, it is believed to be equitable to both the Government and the taxpayer not to pay interest on refunds, nor to collect interest on deficiencies for those 2 years when the refund or deficiency arises out of the application of section 722. With respect to the year 1942, and subsequent years, it is also believed to be equitable for interest not to begin to run on refunds or deficiencies arising out of the application of this relief provision until September 16, 1945, or 1 year after an application for relief has been filed, whichever is later. The reason for this is because more than 25,000 applications have already been filed with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and a reasonable time should be given to the Commissioner to examine the complicated data filed in support of the claims before the Government is compelled to pay interest on any refunds which may be made or to collect interest on any deficiencies which may be assessed as a result of adjustments in other taxes following the granting of the relief under section 722.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAX WITH RESPECT TO TRANSPORTATION OF PROPERTY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3338) relating to Government and other exemptions from the tax with respect to

the transportation of property, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman give a brief explanation of the bill? I might say that the bill has the unanimous report of the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I wonder if this in any way would reach that \$70,000,000 of Marshall Field's that is now escaping both income and inheritance taxes?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill relates only to the transportation tax.

Mr. RANKIN. And the gentleman does not consider it would reach that \$70,000,000?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not think it would.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, there is no tax money involved in this, and Marshall Field does not owe a cent to the Government. Everything that he should pay he has paid, even more, and if the gentleman would be fair he would desist from these continued attacks.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further. I reserved the right to object. A bunch of shrewd lawyers wrote that will of Marshall Field. I have a copy of it. They saw the income tax and the inheritance tax coming, and they wrote this will so as to escape it.

Mr. SABATH rose.

Mr. RANKIN. I decline to yield. This will was written by some shrewd lawyers, in order to close up this Marshall Field estate, and exempt it from inheritance and income taxes, and the money was to be delivered to the present Marshall Field at the time the youngest child became of age, 21 years. That was on the 28th day of September.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, at the urgent request of the leadership on both sides, I will temporarily withdraw the point of order. I will renew it hereafter, perhaps.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan withdraws the point of order temporarily.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to complete my statement that these shrewd lawyers wrote this bill—

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been demanded.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SABATH. I demand the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Now whom is he protecting?

Mr. SABATH. The House and the people.

The SPEAKER. The gentlemen will suspend. No debate is in order. The regular order has been demanded.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3475 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on the transportation of property) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Government transportation: The tax imposed under this section shall not apply to amounts paid for the transportation of property to or from the Government of the United States, or any State, Territory, or political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or to amounts paid to the Post Office Department for the transportation of property."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by section 1 shall take effect with respect to amounts paid, on and after the first day of the first month which begins more than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this act, for the transportation of property on and after such first day.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word in order to respond to the question asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. I simply requested that the gentleman explain the bill briefly.

Mr. ROBERTSON. When we passed the law placing a tax on transportation, it was not intended to apply to the States, but in preshipments, where the shipper paid the freight, the Bureau of Internal Revenue ruled that the States would have to pay the tax. We did not intend to exempt from the tax private shipments on Government barge lines, but that was actually done.

This bill merely corrects those two unintentional errors and has the endorsement of the agencies and the full endorsement of our committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. In order to get the record straight, as I pointed out a while ago, Marshall Field came into possession of between seventy and seventy-five million dollars on the 28th of September, on which he will not pay one dollar of income or inheritance taxes. This bill does not reach that situation, does it?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No, but it does take care of your State Highway Commission that is very much interested in not having to pay this tax on the road material which they buy.

Mr. RANKIN. But this Marshall Field estate got by with this seventy or seventy-five million dollars that was not taxed at all and on the \$10,000,000 invested in Government bonds, Marshall Field will collect \$250,000 a year interest.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. FULMER. Is it the purpose of this bill to repeal the transportation tax as a whole?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No. The Treasury has recommended that that be in-

cluded in a bill now pending, but this does not repeal the whole tax.

Mr. FULMER. There will be a tax on property transported in the future as in the past?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Unless the committee adopts the recommendation of the Treasury Department in the new bill to repeal the tax in toto.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, there is a bill pending which repeals that entire tax, and until that is given further consideration, I object.

The SPEAKER. It is too late to object. Unanimous consent has already been granted.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENDING APPLICATION OF SECTIONS 3114 AND 3115 OF THE REVISED STATUTES, AS AMENDED.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the committee, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of H. R. 3309, a bill to suspend during the present war the application of sections 3114 and 3115, of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. REED of New York. Reserving the right to object: This is rather an interesting war measure, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] will explain, but I have this interest. I live on the Great Lakes, and the traffic that comes down through the Soo Canal and also Detroit is greater than that moving into Liverpool, and at the present time there is a vast movement of iron ore. We are very short of steel in this country. There are some ships over 500 feet in use at the present time, 560 feet and longer, that cannot get into the harbor on the American side for repairs and it is necessary for them to make Canadian ports where the facilities are such that they can be repaired. The delay of one of these ships for just a short time runs into thousands and thousands of dollars, and the purpose of this bill, so far as I am interested in it, is to remove the tariff on those repairs. The other phase of the bill the gentleman from Virginia will explain to the House.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. The statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is absolutely correct. I traveled this summer, from Laurium to Duluth, on one of the steamers that is 621 feet in length and 67 feet wide. It reached Duluth at 1:30, finished loading at 5:30, and started back to Cleveland at 5:30 with 16,000 tons of ore on it.

Another ship was in the lock when we passed through the Soo Locks that was

651 feet long, one of the largest on the Lakes, and a bill of lading was shown to me indicating that it was carrying something over 18,000 tons.

Mr. REED of New York. And is it not true that right now it is important for these great ships to pass into the harbors on the Canadian side for their repairs?

Mr. BLAND. Absolutely.

Mr. REED of New York. And for service.

Mr. BLAND. Absolutely, because they are behind now on the transportation of ore, especially because of the weather and the size of the boats.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] who is complaining because these ships are not permitted to come into the Great Lakes, that if the Congress had passed the rivers and harbors bill which we had up here last year that included the St. Lawrence development, it would not only have provided the deep waterway into the Great Lakes, but it would also have provided the people of New York and New England with cheap electric power and relieved them of the overcharge of \$250,000,000 they now have to pay every year for electric lights and power.

I wonder if the gentleman from New York would join with me and others in a movement to bring that rivers and harbors bill before the House and provide for the development of water-power resources as means of providing post-war employment?

Mr. REED of New York. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that when he gets Marshall Field to pay the tax he is referring to it will help pay the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from New York that if I had my way the bill I introduced would have passed preventing Marshall Field from escaping with that \$70,000,000 untaxed of which he did not earn one penny.

The fact that Field bought \$10,000,000 worth of bonds on which he will receive \$250,000 a year interest does not justify letting that \$70,000,000 escape taxation.

But that is no reason why we should not provide for the development of our water-power resources in this country, and our inland waterways to furnish employment in the post-war period.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill relates principally to the present coastal shipping situation and is a very important war measure. It has the endorsement of the Treasury Department, the War Shipping Board, and I had a letter from the War Food Administrator pointing out how important this measure is, especially with reference to the importation of sugar.

Under the present law repairs made in a foreign shipyard are taxed 50 percent of their value when the ships get back to this country. Under this law our ships that cannot get repairs made in domestic yards because of crowded war business, will be permitted to have

necessary repairs made in foreign yards and the importation of sugar and coffee, two most essential foods, will be expedited.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the application of the provisions of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 19, secs. 257 and 258), is hereby suspended.

SEC. 2. This act shall remain in force until the day following the date of a proclamation by the President that the present war has ended or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President by proclamation, may designate, and shall apply to all duties which have accrued on repairs made, or equipment purchased, on or after December 8, 1941.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the figure "1941" change the period to a colon and insert the following: "Provided, That no claim for a refund of duty pursuant to this act shall be allowed unless a written application for such refund is filed by the party in interest within 6 months from the date of the enactment of this act with the collector of customs at the port where entry was made or the Bureau of Customs: *Provided further,* That nothing in this act shall be construed to require any Federal department or agency to obtain a refund of duty pursuant to this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

Mr. SABATH from the Committee on Rules presented the following report on the bill (H. R. 3070) to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 735) which was read and referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3070), to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INCREASE OF ALLOWANCE TO DEPENDENTS OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, presented the following report on the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family

allowances, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 736), which was read and referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

JAPANESE ON THE WEST COAST

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have here a telegram I received pointing out that the W. R. A. is releasing Japanese and they are being shipped to the west coast.

In this releasing of Japanese from the relocation centers all they are doing is advocating bloodshed. The people of my State, particularly of my district, do not want the Japanese moved back there. As I have said before in this House, the only good Jap is a dead Jap, and that is just what is going to happen to every one of them that is sent back there. So the Government better wake up and keep these Japs in camps where they belong.

Mr. RANKIN. We will try to send them to you.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I did not yield to the gentleman.

The Japanese question on the west coast is going to be a hot one, and the W. R. A. is only bringing bloodshed closer and closer to those people. The proper place to keep them until after the war is over is in the camps where they are at the present time. When the war is over, as far as I am concerned, we should ship every Jap in the United States back to Japan, if there is any Japan left to ship them to.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include certain data I have compiled on allowances and allotments.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COTTON PRODUCTION

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter from Hon. Marvin Jones, with reference to crop quotas.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the War Food Administration announced, according to the press, a crop program for 1944. The article I read, a copy of which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD October 7, 1943, indicated that the same amount of cotton is to be grown in 1944 as was grown in 1943. This would infer that each individual cotton farmer is to grow about the same amount of cotton in 1944 as he grew in 1943. Such an inference is at variance with the facts, according to information many of us heretofore have received and according to a letter Hon. Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator, wrote me October 7, 1943. One sentence of the Jones letter states:

With quotas suspended on the named commodities—cotton is one of the named commodities—a farmer may plant within or in excess of the acreage allotment previously established for the particular commodity and may sell his entire production free of the marketing penalties and restrictions.

I want the entire country to know that the quotas on cotton have been taken off by the authorities of the War Food Administration and the little farmer now has a chance because of this action to make his fair and equitable share of income from cotton.

I herewith include the letter written to me by Mr. Jones:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, October 7, 1943.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR LINDLEY: This is in response to your letter of September 27 inquiring about any quotas or restrictions in the production of cotton and other crops in the 1943 and 1944 agricultural programs.

Flue-cured and Burley tobacco are the only crops for which marketing quotas are applicable in 1943 and 1944. The proclamation of 1944 quotas on these crops has been made on the basis of Public Law 118, Seventy-eighth Congress. Quotas on cotton, wheat, and peanuts were in effect in 1942, but were terminated on the 1943 crops during the current year and will not be applicable for these commodities in 1944. The terminations were made under authority contained in section 371 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. With quotas suspended on the named commodities, a farmer may plant within or in excess of the acreage allotment previously established for the particular commodity and may sell his entire production free of the marketing penalties and restrictions.

Under the 1943 programs a farmer who planted within the farm cotton acreage allotment, or only slightly in excess of it, is eligible for an agricultural-conservation payment, no deduction being made, as was done in prior years, for the small excess acreage. In addition, the cotton produced on the farm is eligible for Commodity Credit Corporation loans. If the acreage planted to cotton exceeded the farm cotton acreage allotment to the extent that the farm is determined to have been knowingly overplanted (sec. 302 (f) of the act) payments and loans cannot be made.

As announced, the 1944 program will provide for establishing farm goals for certain essential food and fiber crops. On a voluntary basis farmers who carry out approved soil and water conservation practices will earn payments at rates now being established. Excepting tobacco, farm-acreage allotments will not be established for any crop, and there will be no restriction on the acreage planted or the quantity of the commodity marketed. Likewise, the acreage planted to any commodity or the extent to which farm goals are met will not affect the payment earned with respect to conservation practices.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two particulars and in one to include an address by His Excellency, the Ambassador of Poland.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein part of a speech made by William Jennings Bryan.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. NORMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Saturday Evening Post entitled, "The Man Who Has Astonished Washington." This deals with our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 12 minutes tomorrow at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today at the conclusion of the other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 3070, TO REPEAL THE CHINESE EXCLUSION ACTS

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may file minority views on the bill H. R. 3070.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article by George Matthew Adams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article that appeared in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the Agricultural Adjustment Agency of Pennsylvania and an editorial from the Potter County Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOCH]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. FULMER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an essay by E. E. Murphy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in reference to Government publications and also to extend my own remarks in

the RECORD and to include several newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT]?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE USED AS PROPAGANDA AGENCY

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 last in this House I charged that the Office of Civilian Defense and the Office of War Information were going far beyond their spheres of activity as outlined by the Congress or the Executive in their creation. Furthermore, I charged that there was a White House clique operating behind the scenes for the promotion of a fourth term. I charged that the O. W. I. was serving in the place of the publicity department of the Democratic National Committee as the propaganda agency for that clique promoting the fourth term.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time I charged that the Office of Civilian Defense was not primarily functioning for the promotion of civilian defense but rather was promoting a revolution in our civilian economy and in our ways of thinking in this Nation. I charged at that time that the heart of the Office of Civilian Defense is the block plan for civilian war services. It is outlined in a pamphlet published by the United States Office of Civilian Defense, printed by the United States Government Printing Office, marked for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C., price 5 cents.

Quoting from the pamphlet, it says:

The block plan is a plan of organization established to insure total coverage of all households for civilian war services.

Now, let us examine those last three words, "civilian war services," and let us see how that program is presently operating in at least one part of the country, and whether or not their activities can be directly classified as civilian war services, bearing in mind further that the pamphlet stated that "the training of the block leaders is the most crucial part in the whole plan"—the whole plan for what? At that time I thought it was solely limited to a fourth term. Again I say, let us look at its latest developments.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand an article which appeared in the Chicago Tribune under date of October 6. Let me read this article. It is headed "O. C. D. aides told: United States must waive independence." I ask this membership to let me know whether this O. C. D. meeting outlined a contribution toward civilian war services or whether it is in fact a contribution toward civilian defense, remembering at the same time, Mr. Speaker, that only recently the ac-

tivities of the Air Raid Warning Service in this country were suspended, releasing hundreds of thousands of civilian volunteers by and with the approval of the President.

Six hundred block captains—

Notice that—"block captains" working under the O. C. D.—

assembled last night by the Office of Civilian Defense, heard Earl S. Johnson, assistant professor of social sciences at the University of Chicago, assert that the United States must give up some of its national independence for the benefit of world security.

Johnson spoke in Schutz High School at the first of a series of meetings designed to train leaders of neighborhood discussion groups throughout the city.

And get this:

The program is sponsored by the morale department of the O. C. D.

Note those words—morale department.

After he had finished his speech, Johnson offered to answer questions, and a member of the audience asked: "Do you believe in the surrender of United States sovereignty in a dominating world federation?" Johnson replied: "If you want world security, I can find no other prescription than that there be some reduction in the absolute independence of the United States. That is the price you must pay."

I wonder what answer Professor Johnson would get from some of the boys' who are fighting in the fox holes and jungles of the Solomons if they were asked whether they are fighting to give up one iota of American independence and the American way of life.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if we have to give up any of our independence and of our sovereignty in the United States, let that be for the American people to decide and let them decide that in a strictly constitutional manner by and with the approval of the Senate of the United States. And above all, let us insist that the O. C. D. stick to its knitting and not have its speakers going around the country educating the block leaders to advocate the surrender of American independence. Have we gone so far in this country as to permit the O. C. D. to become subsidized by those who are advocating Union Now. Have we gone so far as to permit speakers, operating under the auspices of the O. C. D. to be educating our block leaders to pull down the Stars and Stripes and raise instead some flag of some super world state in which we may—if we are lucky—obtain a dominion status? Mr. Speaker, I fully recognize that in the post-war world, we in this country must stand ready to cooperate and collaborate with other nations in the maintenance of world peace, but I am not one of those who, having taken an oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, will go around this country advocating we give up one iota of our independence in order to protect the security of any other nation on the face of this earth. Let us at all times by the Grace of God be the masters of our own destiny.

Let me quote one other statement from this exalted professor. He was asked the question: "How can there be fair competition when inequalities of wealth ex-

ist?" Get that question and analyze it in the spirit of the original thesis of Marxian socialism; and here is his reply:

There cannot be fair intellectual competition while sharp inequality of wealth exists.

From this answer one cannot help but feel that this speaker, selected by the O. C. D. to train its block leaders, who in turn under the block plan are scheduled to become the leaders of discussions within the immediate vicinity of their homes, is fundamentally a disciple of the Marxian philosophy and certainly is not an advocate of the American way of life under which we have been told we can prosper in direct proportion to our individual initiative under a system of private enterprise.

Further to quote Professor Johnson:

As an example, when one newspaper in a city is so much larger than its competitor that it virtually monopolizes the field, there cannot be fair intellectual competition.

Inasmuch as this meeting was in the city of Chicago, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that Professor Johnson is citing the inequality of distribution rather than wealth as it exists between the Chicago Tribune and the Chicago Daily Sun. It is unfortunate that perhaps Professor Johnson does not realize that the distribution of a newspaper is not dependent upon the wealth of its owner because in this instance I doubt that there is little difference in the respective wealth of Colonel McCormick or Mr. Marshal Field; but rather that the success of a newspaper and the relativity of circulation is dependent upon the American right to think as we choose and to read what we choose. I hope that in its selection of speakers to train the block leaders the Office of Civilian Defense will hereafter be careful to select some who have just a little bit of fundamental understanding of the Bill of Rights and just a faint understanding of the American principle of free enterprise in a free Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time that this Congress act to curtail the un-American activities of the O. C. D. The most salutary thing that has happened to this Nation in many years was the wisdom of the Senate in sending five of its Members on a world-wide tour of our many battle fronts and outlying garrisons. It is to the distinct credit of those gentlemen, who have had their eyes opened, that upon their return they have been unafraid to speak frankly and truthfully to the American people and to this Congress on their observations. They have not hesitated to condemn the foreign propaganda activities of the Office of War Information. They have not hesitated to point out the fact that we are not being given credit as a Nation for the multitude of bounties which we are passing out in the form of lend-lease. They have come to realize—as have many of us heretofore—that while we have fighting Allies in this war, nevertheless, we have Allies who justifiably are thinking of themselves first today, and are thinking of themselves first in the post-war world. These gentlemen are not afraid to advocate,

yea to insist, that the time is here when the Congress of the United States, and everyone else in authority in the United States, give some thought to America first now, and America first in the post-war world. I say to you that is a salutary thing. I hope it will bear fruit. If it does, one of the first things this Congress should do, inasmuch as we have now found it possible to discontinue the voluntary efforts of the Air Raid Warning Service, to put an end to the un-American and the political activities of the Office of Civilian Defense and the Office of War Information.

The Office of Civilian Defense must not be permitted to become the publicity department for the Union Now or World State movements.

VICTORY ON THE HOME FRONT

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial taken from the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the time has arrived, if not already past due, for the Lincoln Republicans and the Jeffersonian Democrats to unite for victory on the home front, just the same as the soldiers, sailors, and marines have united for victory on the battle front.

I would not want to inhibit anyone's emotions, but it seems to me that some Members of the Congress have permitted their emotional nature to exceed their intellectual nature.

Isolationism died with James Monroe, but there are still those who bandy the word about in order to throw stardust in our eyes and blind us to their interventionist and internationalist schemes.

My motto is "cooperation but not amalgamation."

The following article describes the theory of the amalgamationists, with which I am not in sympathy:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of October 11, 1943]

RHODES PUPILS IN UNITED STATES POSTS ALMOST TRIPLE DURING YEAR—SOCIETY WOULD REDUCE STATES TO BRITISH COLONY, WRITER SAYS

How American Rhodes scholars have infiltrated key positions in the United States Government, almost tripling their number in Federal service in the course of a year, was disclosed yesterday in the official magazine of their society.

There are now 128 of them in Government jobs, as against 49 when the last survey was made.

These Government workers were educated at Oxford University in England under provisions of the will of Cecil John Rhodes, the great British Empire builder who founded what he called a "secret society," aimed at winning the United States back for England and gaining other territories for the British crown.

RHODES WOULD REJOICE

Rhodes, who was in the habit of laying his hand on a section of the globe and saying, "I want to see all this red (for England),"

would have rejoiced at the way his proteges in America are carrying out his ideas.

Clarence Streit, a Rhodes scholar and the author of *Union Now*, has been one of the foremost advocates of reducing the United States to the status of a British colony, and his fellow Americans from Oxford have been no less energetic in getting control of America's Government, although their methods may have been less spectacular.

The Rhodes men on the Federal pay roll include such top-ranking figures as Elmer Davis, who heads the Office of War Information; Representative J. W. FULBRIGHT (Democrat), of Arkansas, author of a post-war "world security" resolution; ROBERT HALE (Republican), of Maine, stump speaker for the internationalists, and CHARLES R. CLASON (Republican), of Massachusetts, through C. J. Durr, Federal Communications Commissioner; C. D. Mahaffie, Interstate Commerce Commissioner, and dozens of executives in the State Department, Office of Price Administration, War Production Board, and the old Board of Economic Warfare, reorganized after the Wallace-Jones feud on Washington.

The American Oxonian, magazine of the American Rhodes scholars, which lists their names and positions in its October 1942 issue, says in an article in an earlier issue of the same year:

"If Rhodes scholars have not yet fulfilled their founder's hopes in the sphere of politics, their influence in the field of education (which in the long run may well be important) has certainly exceeded everyone's expectations."

This paragraph was written some 9 months before the publication of the roster which disclosed 128 Rhodes men in Federal employment and concerned Rhodes scholars who are now college presidents and professors.

The Washington Times-Herald and the Chicago Tribune first disclosed the presence of Rhodes scholars in Washington jobs in a survey based on the 1940 and 1941 rosters of the American Oxonian, then the latest available. At that time there were 49.

The 1942 directory lists 1,079 living Americans educated under the Rhodes will, from money Rhodes amassed in the diamond and gold fields of South Africa during the latter part of the nineteenth century.

The scholarships provide a grant of \$1,200 tenable for three years at Oxford University. The Rhodes will originally provided that two students should be sent each year to England from each State in the United States and from many of the British colonies.

On the basis of the directors' figures, assuming that all of the 1,166 American Rhodes sent to Oxford completed the full term of residence, the cost of their education to the Rhodes' estate approximated \$4,000,000, not considering whatever overhead there may have been in the trustee arrangement.

FULBRIGHT BILL FAVORS UNION

The Rhodes plan for winning the United States back as a British colony and writing off the effects of the American Revolution parallels the original *Union Now* idea voiced by Lord North before the Declaration of Independence was signed, and rewritten for modern usage by Clarence Streit. The Fulbright resolution, drafted by the Oxonian Congressman, sets up the machinery for such a union.

On the basis of the record in the 1942 roster, 11.8 percent of all living American Rhodes scholars now hold Government jobs. The roster also lists 88 in the Army and Navy, apparently in active service; 31 others in the Naval Reserve, and 17 who hold Army or Navy commissions, indicating that they have permanent assignments in Washington or at military base hospitals, arsenals, or other posts in this country. There are also six who are civilian employees of the Army or Navy.

It is possible the 1942 list is already out of date and that many more of the Oxford educated beneficiaries of the Rhodes will are in Government service.

CAPT. FRANK R. WALKER

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a news item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to pay my tribute to the gallant exploit of Capt. Frank R. Walker, of Alabama, who by skillful maneuvering, daring leadership and indomitable courage wrote a requiem to the efforts of the Japanese to conquer the north Solomon Islands.

On Wednesday evening last at midnight this brave American, although his force was outnumbered 3 to 1, and knowing the odds against him, so maneuvered his destroyer force 15 miles off the coast that within a few minutes time he sent to Davey Jones' locker four Japanese warships and routed a Japanese force that outnumbered his 3 to 1.

This proves conclusively that the fighting qualities of the American fighting men, whether on land, sea, or in the air, are superb, not matched by the men of any other nation. This is because they are so well trained, so well led and have a cause so worthy fighting for.

The article to which I refer follows:

STORY OF SEA VICTORY

Allied Headquarters in the Southwest Pacific, Sunday, October 10.—The Battle of the Solomons surged toward the southeastern fringe of Rabaul, main Japanese South Pacific base, today after an outnumbered and outgunned United States destroyer flotilla single-handedly mauled and routed a triple enemy naval force in a midnight requiem to Japanese control of the north central Solomons.

At least three and probably four Japanese warships, including a light cruiser or destroyer leader, were sunk and two or three other destroyers were damaged badly by a more-than-two-to-one outnumbered force commanded by Capt. Frank R. Walker of Alabama, 44-year-old veteran, in a lightning battle some 15 miles off the northwest coast of Vella Lavella Island Wednesday night, frontline headquarters dispatches reported.

The remainder of a fleet of nine Japanese destroyers, along with gunboats, torpedo boats, and barges sent in as a final evacuation force after the Japanese high command wrote off the central Solomons as a bastion to Rabaul, led in panic before a hail of shells and schools of torpedoes. United States losses were given as "moderate."

(The Japanese Domei news agency yesterday broadcast an Imperial Headquarters communique announcing that the Japanese garrisons had been evacuated from both Kolombangara and Vella Lavella. The announcement, recorded by the Federal Communications Commission, characterized the retreat as a "successful transfer" carried out "almost without enemy interference.")

ADMIRALS SEND CONGRATULATIONS

Both Admiral William F. Halsey, commander at South Pacific headquarters, and Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, Pacific Fleet commander, sent congratulations to Captain Walker, with Admiral Halsey stating:

"Our hats are off in pride for your gallant and determined action. God bless all of you."

Although a spokesman at Gen. Douglas MacArthur's headquarters said the Japanese apparently were on their way to attempt another evacuation from Kolombangara, a dispatch from Francis McCarthy, United Press correspondent at the Third Amphibious Forces headquarters, said the enemy was headed for Vella Lavella, where between 300 and 700 troops had been cornered by American jungle fighters.

Describing the circumstances leading up to the battle, a South Pacific headquarters spokesman said that United States scouting planes had sighted enemy shipping movements southward, indicating that an attempt would be made to evacuate Vella Lavella.

"The latter action indicated the estimate was correct," he added, expressing the belief that the flotilla probably was organized at Rabaul.

"We sent destroyers north in two groups. The advance echelon was under Captain Walker, who spent 16 of 22 years in the Navy at sea. Walker's force arrived in position 15 miles north of Vella Lavella in the Bougainville Strait at 11 p. m., ahead of the second destroyer force."

The spokesman said the United States destroyers were shadowed by Japanese planes all evening so that the enemy knew they were coming. "Captain Walker," he added, "spotted three groups of Japanese craft coming toward his force in fairly close order led by four destroyers and a light cruiser or new-type destroyer leader. This was followed by four destroyers in a group, and the third group of barges, gunboats, and probably torpedo boats."

Deciding not to wait for the second echelon of American destroyers, and thus give the Japanese a chance to escape, Captain Walker sent his destroyers charging in, engaging all nine warships in the first two groups with torpedo and gunfire. The battle lasted only a very few minutes, said the spokesman.

Two of the leading group, a destroyer and cruiser, were seen to blow up and sink quickly. A third destroyer, hit heavily by gunfire and torpedoes, burst into flames from stern to stern and also went down. Hits likewise were observed on other enemy ships and the second Japanese force, with some of its craft damaged, lost heart and fled, said the spokesman. The third flotilla hovered indecisively on the fringes of the action, then scattered northward.

"This engagement again demonstrated the effectiveness of our destroyers when used on the offensive under superb handling. By skillful maneuvering our force was placed in a strategic position to attack the Japanese force," commented Capt. Francis X. McInerney, representative of the commander of destroyers of the Pacific Fleet.

"Our success is not due to luck—it was due to intestinal fortitude coupled with well-trained fighting ships. With such a combination we can never lose."

AMERICANS OF JAPANESE DESCENT

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I heard with a great deal of regret the remarks of the gentleman from California with respect to the War Relocation Authority and the Japanese situation. I should like to put this House straight. There are in the United States of America about 70,000 American citizens of Japanese descent who have proven them-

selves absolutely loyal to American principles. I call attention to the fact that right at this moment there is in Sicily a combat team made up entirely of Americans of Japanese descent. I call attention to the fact that there has not been a single disloyal act of espionage or sabotage on the part of any American-born Japanese. I think it ill behooves a Member of this House when we are today fighting for the "four freedoms" to speak in such an intemperate, immoderate, and un-American way respecting loyal Americans of Japanese descent.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file some reports from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Record and include therein a statement of Dr. Felix J. Underwood, of the Public Health Department of Mississippi against the so-called Wagner bill that proposes to socialize the medical profession of this country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

DISLOYAL AMERICANS OF JAPANESE DESCENT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in a moment I am going to offer a resolution to invite the Senators who have been to the Far East to come here to address the House in secret session. We are entitled to that information.

Let me reply now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

I am not willing to sit here and hear him call un-American the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT], who is not now on the floor.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania says no American-born Jap has ever been found to be disloyal. I wonder if he does not know that some of those American-born Japs signaled to give those brutal Japs our range while they were bombing Pearl Harbor in violation of all the rules of war and in disregard of all the laws of God and man.

I wonder if he did not know that those loathesome Japs were wearing rings showing that they had graduated from American institutions at the time they were shot down at Pearl Harbor. I won-

der if he did not know that Japs who had been born there and had been receiving the protection of the American Government all their lives, were out waving flags and directing the enemy to attack the American Fleet.

I wonder if he did not know that those loathesome Japs who were born in Hawaii, and some of them born in California, Washington, or Oregon, were driving their Fords and smashing the tails of those airplanes to keep our men from going into the air to defend America from the most treacherous, damnable attack the white man's civilization has ever known.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record, and include therein a verse from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE TREASURY TAX PROPOSAL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury tax proposal for the liquidation of the middle-income group is certainly tough enough. On the other hand, its scheme of post-war credits shows a "sissy-pants" attitude toward the meeting of the tax problem. This is no more nor less than a plan to allow our soldiers, when they return, to bear a part of the civilian tax bill which ought to be paid presently. When 10,000,000 soldiers return, with their families they will constitute perhaps 40,000,000 American citizens. They will be given an opportunity to contribute their tax money to repay a part of the civilian tax burden which ought to be borne here and now by the home-front taxpayers. I say that is a reproach to the leaders of the country.

The Morgenthau plan for the liquidation of middle incomes contains not a word about elimination of waste or about savings through governmental economy. The will to fight waste does not exist in the executive department.

The returning soldiers will become the backbone of our economic life during the next few decades. The executive branch of the Government proposes that we ask our soldiers after the war to contribute from their earnings to pay back to civilians the taxes the civilians paid while the soldiers were told they were fighting for the "four freedoms" or the Atlantic Charter. They were not told they were fighting to repay our 1944 tax bill.

Are we going to ask our soldiers to pay our taxes and our grandchildren to pay our grocery bills?

PROPOSED INVITATION TO CERTAIN SENATORS TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last I, with several others, called attention to the importance of having the five Senators who have just returned from the far-flung battle fronts give the Members of the House their findings regarding conditions on the battle fronts. I understand there is some objection to having them appear in the House Chamber. I hope the gentleman from Mississippi and some of the other Members will join in asking them to appear in the Caucus Room. Then we can all have the benefit of their valuable information. It does not matter where we hear their testimony so long as we hear it.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentlewoman will yield, let me say that these are Members of the United States Senate. They have the privilege of the floor. We have a perfect right to invite them here to address the Members of the House in secret session. We want them to come here and give us the benefit of the information they have garnered in their trip to the various battle fronts of the world.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman consulted the Speaker and the leaders about it?

Mr. RANKIN. I have, and I think that when the resolution is offered they will agree that this is the place to have them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is time for the Chair to make a statement, because this matter was discussed with the Chair by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], last week, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], over the phone.

The Chair does not intend to recognize a Member to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution inviting Senators to address the House in open or executive session, because the Chair thinks that is tantamount to an amendment to the rules of the House and, therefore, is a matter for the House to determine. If resolutions like that are introduced, they will be sent to the proper committee.

Mr. RANKIN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, the Speaker has a right to refuse to recognize me for that purpose, but I think if the Speaker will investigate the rules he will find that we have a right to invite those men to come here to address the Members in the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already investigated that and finds it is otherwise. Members of the Senate have the privilege of the floor, but they do not have the privilege of addressing the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would it be within the rules to have a recess, as we do when foreign potentates and rulers come here, and have the Senators come over and talk to us?

The SPEAKER. If the House stands in recess at that time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent brief statement issued by the Missouri Farm Labor Committee on the farm situation in Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the special orders today I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the commissioner of education of Connecticut, and certain schedules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NO CHANGE IN THE DESIGN OF THE AMERICAN FLAG

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, when I returned home and canvassed my district this past summer the thing which inspired me most of all was the opposition expressed by people everywhere to any proposed change in the American flag or substituting for it some other flag of different design. I understand there is a committee afoot dedicated to giving us a new banner in place of our beloved flag. I wish to serve notice on those who are stirring up dissatisfaction with the red, white, and blue—if they can find any dissatisfaction—that, as far as I personally go as a Representative in this House and of the people that I serve, those loyal and patriotic Americans back home, I shall fight with every ounce of my energy to keep intact the present design of the Stars and Stripes. Old Glory has flown over this victorious and prosperous country for 160 years, and she must never be hauled down. Let me repeat, I am against any proposed change in the American flag.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a recent resolution adopted by the Lions Club of Endicott, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from today's New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert an article from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars, in one to include a radio broadcast by Upton Close, and also by Norman Thomas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the close of the legislative business of October 12, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED ADDRESS OF SENATORS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to ask a question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the Member from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] what good it will do to have the Senators come over here and tell us what they found in their travels inasmuch as the House has already without knowing the facts passed the Fulbright resolution committing us to certain participation in a super world government.

Mr. RANKIN. I thought the gentleman from Michigan might need some light.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Some of us knew long ago that we were being taken for

a ride by those who will be business competitors when the war is over.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Nevada State Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a plan for world order, and I ask in that connection that it appear with the capitalizing and the form in which it is presented.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MARSHALL FIELD

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that the gentleman from Mississippi without any reason, cause, or justification continues to assail and attack one of our most honorable citizens, Mr. Marshall Field III, whom I have had the honor and distinction to know personally, and whose distinguished grandfather, one of the foremost American citizens of his time, I was privileged to know. The gentleman from Mississippi again harps that Mr. Marshall Field III came into possession of \$75,000,000 and that the terms of the will in which he is the beneficiary were so drawn that he will not be required to pay an inheritance or income tax. If the gentleman were fair in this matter he would not so often make these unwarranted statements. The fact is that the grandfather of Mr. Field drew the will years and years before the income, inheritance, or estate tax laws were enacted.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Marshall Field III is one of the very few rich Americans who came into great wealth in an honorable and honest manner and has at no time to my knowledge or to the knowledge of the gentleman from Mississippi avoided the payment of his taxes whatever they may have been. He is a real patriotic American who is not hoarding his money, but is expending it in the interest of the masses, the underprivileged, and the wage earner.

Only a few years ago there was built in Chicago by the Field estate with his approval a great housing project at a cost of over \$25,000,000, as I recollect, providing better living quarters for the poor people of that city. On the day that the gentleman from Mississippi last assailed Mr. Marshall Field III, Mr. Field came into possession of this wealth and purchased \$10,000,000 worth of United States War bonds. Does the gentleman from Mississippi know any one of the

many millionaires who has done likewise or even bought half as much as Mr. Field III?

Mr. Speaker, from the speeches made by the gentleman from Mississippi heretofore it has been made clear that he dislikes Mr. Field III because his two publications, PM and the Chicago Sun, have fearlessly printed the truth. These papers have advocated justice for those that are being discriminated against. We in Chicago for years had only one morning newspaper, which was extremely antagonistic and unfair to President Roosevelt, to the New Deal, and to the Democratic Party in general. Therefore Chicago warmly welcomed the Chicago Sun and was grateful to Mr. Field that he had given the city another morning newspaper. The gentleman from Mississippi charges that Mr. Field is publishing these newspapers at a great loss because such loss can be deducted from his income tax, but the gentleman knows that these newspapers were established several years before he came into possession of this \$75,000,000 inheritance which he admits is not subject to the present income-tax law.

Mr. Speaker, unlike most of our millionaires and rich men, Mr. Field is not endeavoring to accumulate greater wealth or make more money. He is spending his income and even part of his capital, as I have stated, in the interest of the masses. It seems to me that the gentleman from Mississippi must know that Mr. Marshall Field III, unlike most of our rich men, is unselfish.

As to the statements of the gentleman from Mississippi that I am trying to protect Mr. Field, that statement is just as unwarranted as his charges are against Mr. Field. He, by the way, does not need any defense at my hands.

Mr. Speaker, since I have been a Member of this House I have urged and advocated higher income, inheritance, and estate taxes, and am urging now high excess-profits taxes and a higher tax on the profits of war profiteers. I have spoken and voted against joint income-tax returns and voted for single tax returns, and I am ready to compare my record on that score with that of the gentleman from Mississippi.

In conclusion I wish to say that I regret I was again obliged to answer the gentleman from Mississippi, and I hope it will not be necessary for me to do so again. I trust that the gentleman from Mississippi will realize that there are many of us who could assail the newspapers that attack us progressive Democrats, but I for one believe in freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and, yes, freedom of religion, and I hope that the gentleman from Mississippi knows that our Constitution so provides.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is violating the rules by referring to the Member from Mississippi as "you."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Chair will state that if the Chair called attention to each and every time

the rule is violated by Members addressing other Members as "you" instead of "the gentleman from," it would be a wearisome task.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I did ask before to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. RANKIN. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman's time has already expired.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already stated that.

CHINESE INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the fathers of our country established for us a free Government untrammelled by any suggestion of the despotic. America fought for and fights to retain our precious heritage. Thirty-two years ago the children of our brave ally China in a revolutionary uprising which ended in the overthrow of the Manchu monarchy, began a battle for the establishment of a republic of China which might enjoy the three people's principles—the principle of the people's nation, the principle of the people's rights, the principle of the people's livelihood. Yesterday the Chinese people, grim, determined, and confident celebrated in manner befitting China's Independence Day. China, our friend, under the brilliant leadership of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, so ably supported by his gracious wife, who by the force of her sincerity and charm won the hearts of all Americans, paused in the continuing battle for Chinese ideals to pay tribute to Sun Yat-sen, her first Provisional President, and his followers who have striven so loyally to reach the glorious objective of their government—a full-fledged constitutional republic. Independence Day means to America a day of joyous thanksgiving for a freedom by revolution that is fast. China celebrates her Independence Day with joy for the victories of yesterday and hope in the final victory of tomorrow. Her revolution for the obtaining of that political democracy when her government will be handed over to her people continues until that day of her realization of republican nationality. The world well knows this history of China—and particularly America, strong, virile, and rich, feels keenly the suffering and the sorrow that follows the blood shed by Chinese for the attainment of her full glory. The people of the United States have a lasting feeling of friendship and respect for the people of China. They know that now and after victory China will play a major part in the development of the post-war world. Americans all desire that everything possible be done to give Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and his brave men maximum assistance in her heroic struggle. Americans all look upward through the blackness of war nights with strong hope that a new day of peace on earth will soon break across this inter-

national horizon—a day when all the Allies can join with China in salute to her national flag—a white sun with 12 rays on a blue sky in a red field—flying high over China—in glorious victory.

China—on your Independence Day—we salute you.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Comptroller General and two articles from the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks and include a copy of a letter I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have just been wondering what the occupants of the gallery think of the procedure and the scene which they have had to witness for the last 30 minutes. I honestly believe that if the majority leadership would rise to the occasion and present a constructive program, such scenes would not be witnessed by the galleries.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

REPEAL OF THE CHINESE EXCLUSION LAW—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 333)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

There is now pending before the Congress legislation to permit the immigration of Chinese people into this country and to allow Chinese residents here to become American citizens. I regard this legislation as important in the cause of winning the war and of establishing a secure peace.

China is our ally. For many long years she stood alone in the fight against aggression. Today we fight at her side. She has continued her gallant struggle against very great odds.

China has understood that the strategy of victory in this world war first required the concentration of the greater part of our strength upon the European front. She has understood that the amount of supplies we could make available to her has been limited by difficulties of transportation. She knows that substantial aid will be forthcoming as soon as possible—aid not only in the form of weapons and supplies but also in carrying out plans already made for offensive, effective action. We and our allies will aim our forces at the heart of Japan in ever-increasing strength until the common enemy is driven from China's soil.

But China's resistance does not depend alone on guns and planes and on attacks on land, on the sea, and from the air. It is based as much in the spirit of her people and her faith in her allies. We owe it to the Chinese to strengthen that faith. One step in this direction is to wipe from the statute books those anachronisms in our law which forbid the immigration of Chinese people into this country and which bar Chinese residents from American citizenship.

Nations, like individuals, make mistakes. We must be big enough to acknowledge our mistakes of the past and to correct them.

By the repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws we can correct a historic mistake and silence the distorted Japanese propaganda. The enactment of legislation now pending before the Congress would put Chinese immigrants on a parity with those from other countries. The Chinese quota would, therefore, be only about 100 immigrants a year. There can be no reasonable apprehension that any such number of immigrants will cause unemployment or provide competition in the search for jobs.

The extension of the privileges of citizenship to the relatively few Chinese residents in our country would operate as another meaningful display of friendship. It would be additional proof that we regard China not only as a partner in waging war but that we shall regard her as a partner in days of peace. While it would give the Chinese a preferred status over certain other oriental people, their great contribution to the cause of decency and freedom entitles them to such preference.

I feel confident that the Congress is in full agreement that these measures—long overdue—should be taken to correct an injustice to our friends. Action by the Congress now will be an earnest of our purpose to apply the policy of the good neighbor to our relations with other peoples.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 11, 1943.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I wish to withdraw my request to address the House today under a special order, and I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to do so on next Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes, at the conclusion of any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE FOOD PROGRAM

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the question of payment of food sub-

sidies is one of the principal domestic problems confronting Congress as well as the people of this country at the present time. This problem has been discussed on the floor of the House and through the press from various angles and with divergent views.

It is agreed the most important thing is that we have the largest food supply than can be produced to take care of the demand of the armed forces as well as civilian requirements and commitments to our allies and to the starving people across the sea. Supplies ought to be furnished at a price commensurate with other costs to the ultimate consumer. No American interested in the welfare of his country wants inflation or exorbitant prices for the things he sells. I do not think the producer should nor does he want to demand anything except a fair share of the Nation's income for his labor in producing food compared with what he is required to pay for the things he needs to buy. Everything possible and reasonable should be done to encourage and meet the increased demand for food supplies of the next year. Officials in high places have conceived the idea that rather than permit certain farm products to bring a price in line with the cost of production that they should hold the line by using money from the Federal Treasury to pay the difference between the amount received for food and the cost of producing it, and this disregards the fact the Nation's income is the largest in history. This money is of course taken from Federal taxes and the sale of War bonds. It ought to be observed right here, too, that our Government formerly paid subsidies to keep prices up, now we have that thing reversed. It is proposed to pay subsidies to keep them down. The proposal is for two and a half billion dollars to support the program for next year. It is obvious that unless this money is paid immediately from increased income taxes that it will be added to the national debt so the boys who are now abroad in our armed forces will have a chance to help pay our grocery bills.

The farmers and producers of this country have taken a lot of unjust criticism with respect to the higher costs of living. The cost of living is the total of things the consumer buys—food, clothing, electric-light bills, transportation, taxes, insurance, doctor bills, and necessities and luxuries for which they spend their money. Food is an important item, and yet on the average of the Nation at large only 21 percent of the consumer's income, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics Bulletin of March 1943, was spent for food. Furthermore, this 21 percent does not all go to the farmer. He gets about 55 percent of the 21 cents. The rest of it goes to retailers, wholesalers, processors, distributors, transportation, license fees, taxes, and so forth. They all come out before the farmer gets his money, so of the 21 cents of the consumer's dollar for food the farmer gets about 11½ cents or 12 cents. Furthermore, less than one-fourth of the consumer's food dollar is paid for meat, so when you talk

about a roll-back in order to decrease the retail price on meat you are talking about a very small proportion of the expenditure by consumers. Do not forget the 6,000,000 farmers in this country are also consumers of all kinds of goods, and do not forget they are not working on a guaranteed or cost-plus basis.

Now I want to direct your attention to the manner in which the so-called roll-back of prices affected the cattle industry when put into effect a few months ago. The O. P. A. decided meat prices were too high, especially beef. Without apparently taking into consideration beef supplies for the future and the need for encouraging production and without considering whether livestock owners would lose thereby, an order went out directing a roll-back on meat prices. It was said, of course, the difference would be made up in subsidies. What happened? The meat packers immediately pushed the price back \$1 to \$2 per 100 pounds on live cattle. The reduction went back all the way down the line. The farmer and the livestock raiser, of course, took the loss. Regardless of statements to the contrary, there are thousands of livestock feeders who have been selling their cattle on the markets during the past few months at a substantial loss. This, notwithstanding the fact that their Government claims it wants to encourage an increase in the production of food. Discouraging prospects for cattle prices in the future with little incentive to finish cattle in the feeding pens, the markets of our country have been crowded with cattle during the past several weeks. Three weeks ago there were more cattle on the principal markets of this country than we had in more than 25 years. Let me give you some recent figures. Beginning with September 13 and ending with September 27 this year, there were 861,400 cattle sold on our 12 principal markets. Only a year ago the figure for the same period was 759,400. Thousands of these cattle went to slaughter that should have gone to the feeding yards where they could be finished. The paralyzing of the livestock market by the O. P. A. will undoubtedly show up in a shortage of meat within the next year.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman from Kansas is always so fair in his statements and covers so completely the subject matter, I believe he will agree with me, since we come from nearly the same section of the country, that a terrific drought which hit our respective southwest cattle-raising districts had something to do with the enormous cattle movement to market.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, that is true; and part of them came from his State, but if the cattlemen could have purchased feed they might have protected themselves to some extent. The gentleman from Oklahoma who, after all, resides in the city and not in the country, if he were familiar with the ques-

tion, would realize that if the cattle growers could have obtained some cottonseed, or some other kind of protein feed at fair prices they could have carried their cattle a little longer and it would not have been necessary to ship so many of them to the market. They would not have been so hard pressed during the past season. But there was no incentive to hold them, so they sold and took a loss.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not now.

Mr. Speaker, the farmer just cannot understand why at this time he is required to accept a reduction of from \$1 to \$3 per 100 pounds for his cattle and sustain a substantial loss in his effort to produce food for the armed forces and civilian use. He does not see that reduction reflected in the price of meat on the retail counter. Neither can he understand why he should sell cattle in Kansas City for \$13 per 100 that "kills out" about 50 percent when the product sells in New York or Philadelphia or Washington for 60 to 90 cents per pound if you can get it.

Mr. Speaker, we do not hear of roll-back on anything else except as affects the farmer. You do not see it reflected in the hotels or eating houses. The menu card on railroad trains and hotels says and I quote, "The prices of our meals are the ceiling price at the highest price quoted by our establishment between February 1 and April 15, 1943." Mr. Speaker, let me call your attention to some further figures. I quote from my local paper in the community where I live. This is of last Friday. The price paid for butter to the farmer for first grade, 48 cents; for second grade, 45 cents. In Washington it is about 70 cents. The farmer in my community gets for his eggs from 36 to 40 cents a dozen. If you buy these same eggs from the retailer in Washington they cost from 65 to 75 cents per dozen.

Mr. Speaker, since it is agreed that an adequate supply of food is our first consideration and since it certainly should be agreed that the farmer and producer are entitled to a fair compensation for his services, I do not believe the payment of a subsidy from the Federal Treasury is the method by which this problem should be solved. Increased production will do more to stop inflation than anything else. If we cannot pay our grocery bills now we will certainly have a tough time doing it after this crisis is over. Our income will be smaller and the demand will be greater. We ought not to ask someone else to help us pay these bills. Does the average American citizen want the Government to help him pay his food bills when the money is needed for our ships and planes and food for our armed forces as well as the Allies abroad? I do not think so. Let us not permit this to be another case of too little and too late.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this country will do everything possible to meet the requirements of the expanded program of the War Food Administration. They will do it in spite of the handicaps that face them. They and their wives

and children remaining at home will work from dawn to sunset in an effort to reach the goal, but Mr. Speaker, if we expect a maximum production in this country it is certainly not unreasonable to suggest that the farmers of this country be given a little encouragement by assuring them that they may have fair prices for their products and reasonable pay for services rendered and that they may have reason to believe that while they are doing their best to provide one of the most important products required for the winning of this war that they can be protected against roll-backs and any other interferences on the part of our Government. The farmer does not want inflation. He knows it will injure him more than anyone else. He just wants a fair price and a little encouragement to produce an abundance of food, and food after all is necessary in the winning of this war.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman from Kansas has mentioned several times in his speech that the Government rolled the prices back on the farmer, and the reason, the gentleman understands, does he not, was the effort on the part of the Government to prevent the farmer from taking a loss after the Government had made an effort to reduce retail prices?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman from Oklahoma knows full well, being familiar with the reports—and I am surprised that he has made the suggestion—he knows full well that the O. P. A. has reduced the price of retail meats and thereby reduced the price of livestock in the markets. If he will examine the market reports he will see that on the principal cattle markets last summer, the day the price was rolled back, the market on cattle went down a dollar a hundred or more in Chicago, Kansas City, Omaha, and other points where livestock was sold, and that loss has never been recovered. As a matter of fact, it went on further down, and the same class of livestock sold at that time is now selling for at least \$2 a hundred less. Those lower prices are not reflected in the retail price of meat and neither has the farmer received any subsidy; neither does he want the subsidy that the gentleman from Oklahoma refers to. He just does not believe he should sustain a loss. I do not think so either.

If any subsidy was paid it must have gone to the packers and processors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SUBSIDIES VERSUS FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in the 9 months I have served in the House that I have asked the indulgence of this body for a special order. Perhaps I have been mindful of the Chinese proverb: "Even a fool may rise to great heights if he keeps his mouth shut." I do not, how-

ever, promise to be so quiet from now on because even though a new Member I desire to have some small part in making a few constructive suggestions as to what ought to be accomplished in the next year. I follow the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] and shall speak on subsidies and food production.

From recent press reports and the hearing before the Banking and Currency Committee it is understood that the War Food Administration is about to ask Congress for an appropriation to carry on an extensive subsidy program. It has attempted the subsidy program in the face of the emphatic opposition of Congress. The administration has been urging a subsidy program against the wishes of nearly all of the farm organizations in this country. I wish someone could explain why the bureaus, who have the food program to administer, do not follow the considered judgment and advice of the men out on the firing line who have the practical knowledge of the food production and distribution. These various groups are consulted but generally their advice is not followed.

In the face of the impending administrative bill which will soon be introduced upon the subject I wish to call the attention of the House and the country to the fact that the experience so far of subsidies in the food program has been one causing confusion and a restriction in the amount of food produced.

The Members of Congress have recently returned from their districts, the food-producing sections of the country, reflecting the thinking of their own constituents, are more than ever opposed to the administration's subsidy program. This un-American policy, in the payment of subsidies, is bound to do a great deal of harm to the producers and the consumers of food in this country.

We have heard a great deal about the holding of the line, which is a nice sounding phrase, but I think we should examine the facts as to who is holding the line in the production of food. This line seems to have a hook and the farmers of the country are the ones that are being hooked. Let me present this bit of evidence. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the Bureau of Labor Statistics concurring have released figures on income and expenses in the production of food. They show without dispute that the cost of food is not the principal factor in a rising price level. In comparing industrial production with factory pay rolls and with living costs which include food costs they find that labor costs per unit of industrial production have increased 65.6 percent while retail food prices have advanced by 39 percent. These figures were as of July 1943. The cost of living has increased 24 percent. The amount of increased labor costs in the things we buy provides an accurate measure of how much labor is contributing to rising prices. The increased labor costs per unit of production is no doubt due to a combination of increased wages, time and a half for overtime and the slow-downs. Farm costs increase with the cost of industrial production and the cost of farm labor. We have no accurate figures on farm costs because there was a

failure to include farm wages in the parity formula. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics shows that the increase in earnings in all lines of industries since Pearl Harbor with a few exceptions, like those engaged in water transportation in war zones, that the greatest increase of wages has been that of farm workers.

The increased costs in retail food and the cost of living is reflected both in the things farmers buy and in the labor they hire. The things the farmers buy and that which goes into the production of food has gone up. With the increased amount that labor now receives in comparison to the cost of food it seems unusual that labor leaders should continue to attack agriculture and demand roll-backs in food prices. If the subsidy is a remedy, which we doubt, then we should start where the trouble lies and roll back wages so it can begin to cut down the costs of production. I am not advocating such a move but suggest that as an inflation curb it would be much sounder than that of rolling back farm prices. A subsidy in farm prices stifles production. It provides the already swollen purse of the public with additional funds. This is definitely inflationary.

If one analyzes the figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics it shows that in June 1943 the average weekly earnings of labor stood at an index of 163. The cost of living index was 124. It further shows that the living-index costs have only gone up 24 points since January 1941 while the wages of the working man have gone up 63 points. If the analysis of this Bureau is correct, and they should be, it would seem that farm prices should be permitted to go up and this would make a further subsidy to the consumers of foods unnecessary.

The further thought on holding the line the cattle feeders of Nebraska and Iowa points to the following examples in the cost of their feed operations. In eastern Nebraska corn will cost close to \$1 per bushel where a year ago it was 65 to 70 cents. The protein feeds which now are almost unattainable will cost from \$65 to \$30 a ton. A year ago they were \$45 a ton. Labor costs are \$100 a month plus extras, while a year ago it was \$65. There are many other items in the cost of feeding such as salt and hay that have greatly advanced.

The cattlemen have passed a set of resolutions which in general state that the uncertainty which exists among cattle feeders and producers comes from the activities and attitudes of certain Government agencies. The cattle producers and feeders would like to have a definite statement as to what is wanted in the way of meat production during the next year. What type and degree of finish is desired? The cattle producer and feeder want an end to the threat of imposing price ceilings on live animals. They want cattle raising and feeding recognized as an essential part of the food-production program.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of this House and country to the national food conference which was held in Chicago on September 16 and 17. At this meeting there were the producers,

processors, distributors, and the consumers. They adopted the following recommendations:

1. Fair prices at the market place instead of the present system of subsidies which tend to place food production and distribution under bureaucratic control.
2. That no roll-back of prices be financed out of Government funds and no subsidies either direct or by subterfuge be paid.
3. Obtain maximum production as the best means to halt inflation. Protect consumers against the further growth of black markets.
4. When increased production is requested by the Government, floor prices must be guaranteed on all such commodities, to insure against loss those assuming such war risks.
5. Timely provisions for skilled labor, necessary machinery, supplies, and equipment must be made.
6. Unification of the whole food-production, processing, and distribution program, in one Government agency.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the splendid statement he is making. He is giving the House some irrefutable facts in the form of statistics.

I think it should be emphasized at this point in view of the fact that future generations of taxpayers are going to resent bitterly the political trick of charging them with today's grocery bill. I think we should emphasize the fact that the stigma for that should not fall on the farmers; the farmers are not asking for food subsidies, it is a little coterie of New Deal politicians attempting to pass it on to the people. This should be clear in the Record.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, there is a program in a nutshell which will solve many of the ills in our food program.

The production and distribution of food in this country has always been on the basis of free enterprise. The American farmer with his access to market conditions by radio and through the press has learned to gauge his production program to consumers' demand. The American farmers know just as well, yes, a great deal better than the bureaucrats of Washington the type of food his land can best raise. He knows his equipment, his labor problems. He should be assured a floor under the food that he is raising. There should be a ceiling to keep the food from going too high. Then if the farmers are given the price incentive along with the necessary labor and machinery he will produce to the utmost. Let me state right here a fact that I fear our food experts have failed to remember. The only way to keep down the cost of food is to bring production up to the demand.

At the recent meeting held by the Co-operative Milk Producers Federation which has the support of the leading farm organizations of the country the whole program of proposed food subsidies and price roll-backs was strongly criticized and vigorously attacked as be-

ing deceptive and unworkable. It was attacked as a fraud which would pass the cost of everyone's grocery bill on to the men who would soon return from the armed forces. They stated:

1. That food subsidies represent a constantly increasing public debt which will be transferred in a large part to our fighting forces, the majority of whom are serving for \$50 per month.

2. Food subsidies are inflationary. Printing bonds to pay for foods is not like printing currency to pay for governmental experiments.

3. Food subsidies imply that the Government intends to share more or less permanently the payment of grocery bills for its citizens without regard for their capacity to pay for their own way through life.

4. The milk subsidy which is being worked out on the basis of individual subsidy payments to some 3,000,000 producers of milk will strengthen bureaucratic control over the life of our farm people. The terms and conditions of receiving a subsidy constitutes the exercise of policing power not contemplated by existing laws. Government by regulation is constantly supplanting government by law. Government by regulation repeatedly emerges into government by fear.

Mr. Speaker, the idea of subsidies is just as un-American as is the idea of monopoly. It is the very essence of bureaucracy. Under it government becomes the master instead of the servant of the people. If persisted in it will destroy free enterprise.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. After all, does not a subsidy really mean taking it off the grocery bill but putting it on the tax bill plus administrative expenses? And the administrative expenses are what eat up money.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is correct.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the very able address he is making. Is it not furthermore true that the farmer as well as every other citizen of the United States will be taxed in order to pay these subsidies?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is correct.

Mr. SHORT. So that the roll-back program should really be called the roll-under program, because it plows the farmer under; it does not roll him back, it rolls him under.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is correct; I thank the gentleman.

Subsidies do not prevent inflation, they merely change the form of inflation. Everyone who is a taxpayer must help to pay the cost of subsidies. In addition we must pay for the Government's activities in manipulating a subsidy program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us examine the principle of subsidies from the practical standpoint. Let us see what effect it will have on our present problem of getting food at a reasonable price. In the first place it has and it will continue to create uncertainty in the minds of producers and consumers alike for they all know that the power to grant subsidies

and the power to withhold them will rest in the hands of certain bureaucrats in Washington. In the face of this uncertainty and because of the shortage of help and machinery and because of the additional red tape and confusion the producer cannot give an all-out effort in the production program. This will result in less production. On the other hand, the consumer of food will be under a great temptation to hoard because he is already acquainted with coffee rationing, which was not needed, and the fact that subsidies on meat and butter have resulted in a shortage of these commodities. Certainly, the subsidies adopted so far have disrupted the normal procedure of production and distribution. Subsidies will let loose a whole new flood of orders which require record keeping and Government supervisors.

By whatever amount of money the Government attempts to support subsidies by just that amount does it increase inflation. In other words, if the Government grants subsidies to the amount of \$1,000,000,000 it will create \$1,000,000,000 more buying power which, when added to the reduction in production due to the needs created by the program, it will cause a further unbalance in the relationship between the supply of goods and the purchasing power of the people. Subsidies do not fall like manna from heaven, someone must pay the bill. Someone must also pay the costs in the operation of the program. The money the Government borrows to pay subsidies so that your grocery bill and mine may be lower will have to be repaid and with interest by those very men and women who are now fighting our battles. It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that it would almost be a crime for this Congress to appropriate money or to permit the Government to borrow money to pay our grocery bills.

The cost of a proposed subsidy program would be hard to estimate. It might well cost more than \$5,000,000,000. The money thus expended by the administration would purchase the complete regimentation of agriculture and the right of someone in Washington to decide what people should raise for other people to eat. The efforts thus far by the Washington bureaucrats along this line have been entirely faulty and destructive. The Washington bureaucrats who continue to tangle with the farm program are causing a limited supply of food and this acts as a weapon to keep control by the Government over agriculture.

Our Government has made commitments to feed the liberated nations. This cannot be done when there is a large group in the Agriculture Department who are still under the obsession that there must be a limited supply of crops planted. It is well to remember that it was but a few months ago that the Agriculture Department formally gave up plans for limiting wheat acreage and it is also a fact that even after these plans were announced a farm organization leader protested, and the Secretary of Agriculture has never issued a denial that the Government authority would be used to prevent the raising of wheat by

those who have not previously been raising it. Certainly the Government's policy in the farm areas with certain supporting food prices in preference to other crops has caused a marked shortage of certain foods.

The Department of Agriculture should issue an early program for the production of food. This program should remove all acreage limitations. It should announce a support price and a ceiling. The support price should be the floor and the lowest price the farmer is to receive. There should also be a ceiling which is the top price which might be received for that product. It should be the same as the O. P. A. ceiling. The farmer should then plan his own crops without Government interference. He can do this without the gentlemen in Washington hatching up schemes to control his production. Such schemes in the past have caused a diminishing food supply.

Let me repeat again the ideas of subsidies are totally un-American. They are contrary to our idea of free enterprise. It is Government control of production in its worst form. Crying down through the last century and a half comes those warning words of Thomas Jefferson:

Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap the people would soon want bread.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and the special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WHAT MISSOURI ASKS OF WILLKIE

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on September 1 of this year, nine questions were asked Mr. Willkie by the Missouri Republican Party's principal State and national officers and all of the Missouri delegates to the 1940 convention at which Mr. Willkie was nominated.

Those questions were asked Mr. Willkie in a letter, a copy of which follows:

DEAR MR. WILLKIE: The undersigned constitute all of the principal officers of the Missouri Republican Party and all the members of the Missouri delegation of the Philadelphia Convention of 1940. We were the first Middle Western delegation to give you a large vote. We believe that in those few memorable days we were instrumental in exerting some measure of influence on the delegations from other Middle Western States to join us in nominating you. We worked energetically for your election, so much so, that normally Democratic Missouri gave you as large a percentage of its vote as did normally Republican Ohio and normally Republican Pennsylvania. We have proved our friendship to you in the past. We are not unfriendly now.

We are unanimously of the opinion that in the post-war world America should seek

whatever arrangements of world affairs are in the best interest of America. We are in favor of whatever international commitments promise best a peaceful future, and which will enable us to again pursue our happiness in the traditional American way of freedom under the principles and liberties guaranteed by the Constitution of our Republic.

We seek enlightenment on method. We should like to have your considered views about this world when it is again at rest. We would like to know what you mean when you say "One world."

1. Do you believe that the United States should become a member of a world supranational state? If so—

a. Would it involve any limitation upon the sovereignty of the United States?

b. Would it mean that the Army, Navy, and Air Force of the United States and its technical equipment for war are to be placed under the control of the world state?

c. Would it mean that, except for domestic police purposes the United States is to have no independent military force of its own?

2. If you favor a world state, what would you do about nations that refuse to come in?

a. Force them in by military means?

b. Treat them as outlaws by not permitting them to trade with the members of the world state?

c. What other action would you favor?

3. Do you believe in absolute freedom of international trade?

a. Will that mean that the goods and services of peoples with low living standards are to enter the United States without any restrictions designed to protect the American standard of living?

b. If you believe in restrictions, please state what they are to be.

4. Do you believe that a world monetary system should be established? If so,

a. What is to be the reserve for its currency?

b. What relationship is it to have to the American dollar?

c. How is it to be administered?

5. Do you believe in the free and unrestricted movement of peoples? If so, how do you propose to prevent the peoples from Asia and other war-torn countries from overrunning the United States?

6. Do you believe that it is desirable for America to permit flooding our country with alien individuals and alien ideas? If so, what effect do you think this would have on our particular civilization?

7. In what other respects do you envision the political and economic organization of one world?

8. Newspapers report you to have said that if the Republicans adopt a liberal platform they can win. We want to win!

What do you mean by a liberal platform? Be specific, please.

9. If by any chance you are not the Presidential nominee of the Republican Party in 1944, will you, as a good Republican, actively support the nominee chosen by the Republican Convention?

As we may desire to memorialize our representatives on the Policy Committee of the Republican National Committee, we shall be very appreciative of a reply, item by item, addressed to the chairman of our delegation, by September 10.

Sincerely yours,

GROVER W. DALTON,

Delegation Chairman,

1940 Convention,

Chairman, Missouri Republican

State Committee.

I have the consent of all the following delegates and party officers to the signature of their names to this letter:

F. William Autenrieth, twelfth district; Henry M. Carey, second district; Mack Denman, at large; T. H. B. Dunnegan, sixth district; Frank R. English, fourth district; Joe

Grandhomme, eighth district; Paul Groeschel, second district; Luke E. Hart, thirteenth district; Edmond Koeln, twelfth district; A. Kraemalmeyer, eighth district; H. M. Langworthy, at large; Homer B. Mann, fifth district; Arthur McKim, fourth district; Don McVey, first district; Louis E. Miller, eleventh district; W. A. Morant, at large; Albert J. Ott, thirteenth district; W. F. Phares, third district; Edgar M. Queeny, at large; Sidney R. Redmond, eleventh district; J. W. Reese, seventh district; Charles Rendlen, first district; Edw. L. Scheufler, fifth district; Harry Scott, ninth district; Leo Simmons, seventh district; H. T. Simpson, tenth district; W. D. Smith, sixth district; A. B. Suenkel, ninth district; G. L. Zwick, third district. Charles Ferguson, State chairman in 1940; Miss Cleta Smith, State vice chairman in 1940; Barak T. Mattingly, national committeeman; Mrs. Myrri E. Remley, national committeewoman; Mrs. Frances J. O'Meara, vice chairman, Missouri State Committee.

Upon receipt of these questions, Mr. Willkie replied that he would be glad to answer them, and any others which the signers of the letter might put to him. He added, however, that the replies would have to be "off the record."

The press and many members of the Republican Party protested to Mr. Willkie that his answers to these questions were of public interest and should not be given in a closed meeting.

Newspapers then quoted Mr. Willkie as saying: "They are not going to put Wendell Willkie on the spot," and he characterized the questions as "bearing no relationship to reality."

Later, he was quoted as saying the questions were "ridiculous" and that he would not answer them.

Still later, he announced: "I will make a public appearance and talk on a subject of my own choosing," adding that his views on the subjects covered by the questions were "well known."

Finally, subsequent to all the foregoing, he announced that he would speak "on the subjects covered by the questionnaire."

Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that as a result of what has transpired since the questions originally were asked Mr. Willkie, there is a great deal of confusion in the public mind regarding the purpose of these questions and Mr. Willkie's shifting attitude toward them.

I know, from the queries I have received from fellow Members of this House, as well as my constituents in Missouri, that many are wondering if the Missouri Republicans who worked so diligently for Mr. Willkie during the last election are now solidly against him; or if the issues have been beclouded by Mr. Willkie himself in his rapidly changing viewpoint toward them.

It seems appropriate that I, who was one of the signers of the letter to Mr. Willkie because of my support of him at Philadelphia as a member of the Missouri delegation, should seek to clarify the position of Missouri republicanism and answer some of the uncertainties before Mr. Willkie makes his visit to Missouri. I feel that I am a proper one to do it because I spent considerable time and effort as one of his preconvention managers in enlisting interest in his behalf among the Missouri delegation to

the convention, and because, in Washington, I am able to maintain a perspective that perhaps might not be possible to one who has been living in the State during the last several weeks and been subject to the many diverse comments current there.

In justice to those who signed the letter to Mr. Willkie, I know there was no desire to put him "on the spot." There was a very real desire, however, to get him "on the record" before decision could be made on his solicitation of the support of many whose names appear on that letter.

Likewise, in fairness to Mr. Willkie, I think his ultimate decision to speak publicly on the subjects covered by the questionnaire is commendable and is what he would have made in any event. Unfortunately, perhaps, in the interval while arriving at his final decision he spoke rashly in response to questions that I believe were designed to further a public understanding of the position of both Mr. Willkie and the Republican Party.

I am convinced that Mr. Willkie's final decision in any case would have been to cover the subject matter of these questions, because I believe sooner or later he would have examined his published statements and articles to see what answers he had given there, and would have found no adequate replies to any of the specific questions asked.

Now I am delighted to learn that he will speak on the subjects covered by the questionnaire. This is in accord with our previous conception of Mr. Willkie for candor and courage.

Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Willkie's views on these subjects were well known, there would have been no occasion to propound these specific questions to him by his 1940 supporters, who wrote him—and meant it—that they are not unfriendly to him now.

As will be indicated hereafter, the questions do not in any sense warrant the characterization of being "ridiculous." I think a fair examination of the facts will show they are most material and relevant. Moreover, that they bear a significant relation to Mr. Willkie's utterances and to the activities of his sponsors and advisors.

Mr. Speaker, the country craves light from its leaders and not heat in charting its course. It insists upon candor and courage and not equivocation. In these times, in the great intellectual arena of thought and debate, America must have men who are willing to stoutly assert their love for and their belief in our form of government and its institutions, and also condemn any proposal which would make us a vassal in the society of nations. America has come of age and must assume its rightful role and play its part manfully in the international tomorrow.

Our party, in 1863, struck the shackles of servitude from the hands of millions of Americans. America must now be ready to fulfill its manifest destiny and emancipate mankind from the tyranny of political, economic and racial despots.

Presumably such views as Mr. Willkie has on our post-war relationships with

other nations are contained in his book, *One World*, which is both a pleasing travel record and a very inspiring moral philosophy.

However, I am unable to find in this book one specific recommendation as to how its philosophy can be implemented. Stassen and Hoover, on the other hand, have advanced specific proposals. Dewey has pronounced himself in favor of an alliance with Britain. I would conclude from my own rereading of *One World* that Mr. Willkie favors the retention of national sovereignties, because of his reference to "a new society of independent nations." I might also conclude that he favors a world state by his frequent references to a united nations and a sentence such as "The United Nations must become a common council."

Mr. Speaker, a resort to the dictionary tells us that the word "united" means "joined together to form a whole—incorporated into one." "Common council" is defined as "a legislative body." Is it a correct interpretation to assume that Mr. Willkie's post-war United Nations means the nations of the world incorporated into one with a common legislative body? Or—if that is not the proper interpretation of Mr. Willkie's meaning, are not the Missouri members of his party doing both Mr. Willkie and the country at large a service by enabling him to amplify and more clearly define his meaning?

Mr. Willkie, I note, also makes frequent references in *One World* to a "new society" that will arise. The established meaning of "society" is "a collected body of persons composing a community or the aggregate of such as subjects of a civil government." Is it correct, or is it not, for one to assume that such a new society contemplates that the world's people are to be an aggregate of subjects of one civil government?

It is not my idea, and I know it was not the idea of the other signers of the letter, to read unintended meanings into Mr. Willkie's utterances. Perhaps the dictionary meanings are the ones Mr. Willkie also means. Perhaps not. If they are, no one will contest his right to hold such opinions—but the fact that they are his opinions should then be on public record so that the members of his party may support or oppose him according to their own beliefs on the question of a world state.

Mr. Speaker, a clear interpretation by Mr. Willkie of these meanings is important for another reason as well. That is, because of the published attitudes of his associates in New York's Freedom House. Mr. Willkie was one of the founders of, and is now a member of the board of directors of, Freedom House, which was formed by a group which long prior to Pearl Harbor was on public record as campaigning for American intervention in the European war. It is also a matter of record that he has appeared frequently before the members of this organization.

Many of Freedom Houses' directors and members are active in Clarence Streit's Federal Union Now, which petitioned President Roosevelt to submit to

Congress the Union's plan for a supranational federal union comprising the United States and the members of the British Empire—and to which Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, and Finland would be admitted on equal terms as soon as they were freed from Hitler. This federal union would also admit other nations such as India, China, and Russia as soon as they had established a democratic government. All the foregoing is from publicly stated objectives of the federal union group.

The United States would occupy in such a supranational state the same relative minority position that Missouri now occupies in the United States. Even after the war, its representatives in the proposed parliament would form a minority. The proposed constitution of Streit's supranational state would give to it all military forces except national militias and police; it provides also for absolute freedom of international trade, emigration and immigration within such a state; and the sole power to coin money would rest within such a state. Again, these are publicly stated objectives of this group.

The petition from this federal union organization, urging Presidential action on its objectives, states:

Let us begin now a world united states.

Mr. Speaker, that federal union petition would bear no great significance in connection with the questions that the Missouri members of his party have asked Mr. Willkie, if it did not carry the signature of several of Mr. Willkie's associates in Freedom House, and if it had not been signed by Russell Davenport, the talented publicist who resigned the editorship of *Fortune* in order to manage Mr. Willkie's last campaign, and who remains his intimate and trusted adviser.

The petition was signed also by Mr. Willkie's companion in his flight around the world, Gardner Cowles. Mr. Cowles is an active Willkie man; he is also publisher of *Look* magazine, in which Mr. Willkie recently opened formally his current campaign for the Republican nomination.

Furthermore, among those commonly understood to be the largest contributors to Federal Union, Inc., are the publisher of the pro-Willkie *Life*, *Fortune*, and *Time*, and the international banker, Mr. Thomas Lamont, long known as one of Mr. Willkie's staunchest and most liberal backers.

I am not expressing thoughts that the federal unionists themselves have not documented clearly when I say that they brand national patriotism as an anachronism in this day of the airplane. They believe it is the cause of wars. They would modify the Stars and Stripes and exchange the Declaration of Independence for a declaration of interdependence. They would be, in their own words, "citizens of the world first, and secondly, American citizens." They hold, with Mr. Justice Roberts of the Supreme Court, that "for the sake of world peace we must be willing to surrender our national sovereignty." Their objective is not a mere league of independent nations or an international al-

liance; they want to begin now a world united states. They are antinationalists—in a word, they are globalists.

But, Mr. Speaker, it would be straining words and unfair to accuse this group, which contains so many distinguished men, of renegade treason, which is the ultimate of antinationalism. That would be as unfair as it was for Mr. Willkie to accuse those who asked him the questions of September 1 of isolationism.

Treason is more the word for the antinationalism of Freedom House than is isolationism the word for any of the men or women who declared in the Missouri letter to Mr. Willkie that they are—

unanimously of the opinion that in the post-war world America should seek whatever arrangements of world affairs are in the best interest of America. We are in favor of whatever international commitments promise best a peaceful future and which will enable us to again pursue our happiness in the traditional American way of freedom under the principles and liberties guaranteed by the Constitution of our Republic.

If this is isolationism in Mr. Willkie's mind, it would appear that he favors going much further. Would a Federal Union alone satisfy him?

It is not my desire, Mr. Speaker, to give unintended interpretation to Mr. Willkie's philosophy, or to impute to him the philosophy and purposes of his associates in Freedom House and those of his backers and advisers with Federal Union, Inc.

However, I am reminded of the truism that "a man is judged by the company he keeps."

Mr. Willkie's book and his speeches fail to define his position on a subject where the position of so many of his close associates is amply clear, and—to many Americans—obviously inimical to our country's national interests.

As a candidate for the Republican nomination, Mr. Willkie owes it to his 1940 supporters in Missouri and the Nation to state his position clearly and definitely.

That is the one—the only—reason why the questions were addressed to him.

The eighth of those questions begins:

Newspapers report you to have said that if the Republican Party adopts a liberal platform it can win.

Then the question asks:

What do you mean by "a liberal platform"?

As I have always understood the meaning of a true liberal, he is one who advocates freedom of the individual from government restraint in his political, spiritual, and economic life. Early true liberals fought for and secured for us the repeal of many statutes that restrained individual freedom. By slow and progressive processes they secured freedom of speech, freedom for the individual to worship in his own way, freedom of the press, and individual economic freedom. Woodrow Wilson phrased it this way:

The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it.

The true liberal philosophy was never better expressed than in our own Declaration of Independence and in the or-

ganic law of our land, the Constitution of the United States, and its Bill of Rights. Thomas Jefferson was the world's greatest and most effective exponent of true liberalism, and it was to uphold his principles that the Republican Party was founded. At no previous time in world history and in no part of the globe were these principles ever so operative as in the United States. They are responsible for America's unique spiritual and material progress—the phenomenon that is beating the Axis.

Before his nomination 4 years ago, Mr. Willkie personified the result of this liberalism—American individualism. In the best American tradition he had pulled himself up by his own bootstraps to the presidency of a large corporation. He declared that "business is the power and glory of America." He had waged a long and successful fight against incipient state socialism, as exemplified by the T. V. A. He inveighed against other Government agencies that were encroaching here and there upon individual freedom. He called it, and properly, "big government."

He sought refuge in the Republican Party because his own had departed from true liberalism, as confirmed in his official campaign biography of 1940, which said:

He had his training in the Democratic Party, which he opposes today, because he feels that this party departed from its ideals of pro-Americanism as expounded by Jefferson.

Also, in reporting a speech at San Francisco in March 1940 the biography says:

Willkie gave his concrete idea of a liberal: "A liberal," he said, "is a man who believes first in liberty."

In recent years within our country a different philosophy has misappropriated to itself the word "liberal." It poses as altruistic and patriotic. It advocates the constant increase of governmental power. Now it preaches that if we relinquish our individual freedom to a benevolent state, want and fear will vanish, not only in America but everywhere. It believes that through continued maintenance during peace of the present controls over prices, production and employment, and with the privilege to spend billions and trillions, a myriad of commissars and petty despots can bring about a better world. We have seen some of this stupid, rigid, and extravagant regimentation in action.

This is not the true liberalism advocated by Mr. Willkie in 1940. Rather, it is a neoliberalism. Its ultimate phase is Caesarism—a totalitarian state like Russian communism—wherein all individual rights to liberty disappear, except those which are bestowed or permitted at the pleasure of a despot.

In the deep pink vanguard of this neoliberalism is the weekly *New Republic*. In the eyes of the neoliberal editors of the *New Republic*, three of whom are listed by the Dies committee as members of Communist front organizations, the New Deal could do no wrong except that it never went fast enough nor far enough. Their wistful gaze was seemingly directed

toward Moscow. They have been constant and morbid critics of true liberalism, and agree petulantly with another proponent of their philosophy, Stuart Chase, when he declares that one nation should not have "all the fun of making the world over."

From the pen of the editor of the left wing Michigan Chronicle comes this bewildering statement:

I am a New Deal Democrat with my left eye on Wendell Willkie and my right eye on HENRY WALLACE. And I insist that I am not cross-eyed.

The New Republic of August 23, contains an article from the pen of one of its neoliberal editors, George Soule, author of *A Planned Society* and *The Coming American Revolution*.

Did the liberals who opposed Wendell Willkie in 1940 misjudge him?

Soule asks.

Since the war began, his public record has, in their eyes, been brilliant. Not merely has he gone far ahead of his own party in his attitude toward international affairs and preparations for peace; he has at crucial points said the right thing when Mr. Roosevelt himself either failed to say it or by the action of his administration seemed to be going in the wrong direction.

Mr. Soule heaps encomiums on Mr. Willkie for his failure to utter one word of criticism against the administration's domestic policies. Mr. Soule, at least, assumes that silence signifies assent. Mr. Speaker, I hope and I believe that Mr. Soule has misinterpreted Mr. Willkie. How could one seek to be a candidate against a philosophy with which he is in agreement? True liberalism and neoliberalism are the antithesis of each other and no political alchemy or legerdemain can ever bridge the two.

That is why we of Missouri asked Mr. Willkie: "What do you mean by a liberal platform? Be specific, please." Neither in any of Mr. Willkie's previous writings, nor in his latest published pronouncements in *Look*, do I find an answer to this question that is adequate in its definition of a liberal platform or specific in stating how the planks in such a platform are to be converted into realities.

Answers to those nine questions in that Missouri letter of September 1 concern a man's fundamental philosophy, Mr. Speaker. There is no question there of timing. One's basic, personal philosophy should not change with the phases of the moon nor from year to year, nor with the approach of an election, else it becomes merely a philosophy of opportunism. Nothing can be gained by anyone by concealment or equivocation. Because of the possibility it may profoundly have an effect not only on our lives but on the lives of generations yet unborn as well, Mr. Willkie's philosophy should be a matter of public knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the purpose of any responsible member of this party in Missouri to embarrass Mr. Willkie. We have long admired him. Our delegation did much to bring about his nomination; we fought hard for his election. It is possible that he may be the Republican

candidate again, in which case we will work for his election. Therefore, we do not seek to do anything which, in the event of his nomination, would harm his chances of election. Indeed, it is our belief that if Mr. Willkie answers our questions frankly and makes his true position known publicly, it will enhance his chances of the Republican nomination. It is the very confusion resulting from conflicting interpretations of his position which is his greatest handicap.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that these questions were not asked any other potential candidate for the nomination because of three reasons. Firstly, neither this nor any other similar chain of circumstances surrounds any other man. Secondly, no other potential candidate or leading member of the Republican Party has urged publicly that his party take a definite position in favor of a world outlook in preference to national interests, without at the same time giving his own formula for accomplishment of such a goal. On the contrary, specific proposals have been advanced by Stassen, Hoover, and Dewey, each with definite consideration for the interests of the United States. Lastly, no other potential candidate has solicited the active support of many of the signers of the letter which was sent to Mr. Willkie, as will be attested by the Republican State chairman, Mr. Grover Dalton.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a summary of why Missouri sent its questions to Mr. Willkie. It is a summary of what Missouri asks of Mr. Willkie today. I have, I think, been objective in my statement of the facts—and I do not believe they are facts that will bring issue from any man or woman who is sincerely interested in the preservation of a free, strong, and independent America among the future family of nations. America at this time demands a leader of high courage, vision, and purpose. It must have a leader who possesses a big mind and big heart, sufficiently large to comprehend the desires of millions who want to keep our form of government and make it strong and great, while at the same time playing our part manfully among the nations of the world. America now is thinking in terms of what is best for America. Mr. Churchill is thinking, acting, and speaking in terms of what is best for England. He does not favor the liquidation of the Empire. Mr. Stalin is thinking, acting, and planning in terms of what is best for Russia. We must be mindful of what is best for America. The country demands this. Translated into simple terms—it is but patriotism in performance. To propose less would be treason. But we cannot and we will not shirk our part and our duty in preparing a better post-war world.

I believe Mr. Willkie will speak in Missouri on the subjects covered by the questionnaire of September 1—and I believe he will do so fully, definitely, and publicly. I am yet unable to say that Mr. Willkie entertains beliefs similar or identical to those held by his associates of Freedom House or by the members of Federal Union, Inc. If I am mistaken in my assumption that he does not sup-

port such convictions, then at least I would be the last to deny him his right to such opinions or his public expression. If, on the other hand, his beliefs are at variance with those of his associates in these organizations and of the editors of the *New Republic*, I know that many millions of Americans who supported him in 1940 would welcome a clear statement to that effect. In either case, the nine Missouri questions offer Mr. Willkie the opportunity to state his true position, whatever it may be, without equivocation. I am confident that he will avail himself of that opportunity.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman spoke about certain platforms. May I suggest that the Democratic platform of 1940 was a splendid platform, but it is still new. It has never been used. I am wondering whether we can put much faith in any platforms or the statements of people before Presidential campaigns.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. They have not used up all the 1928 Communist platform yet.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow at the conclusion of other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES]? There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

INVESTIGATION OF LEND-LEASE OPERATION

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to tell the full story of lend-lease. This Congress cannot sit idly by in view of insistent public demand that all of the facts in connection with this program be revealed. We have not been frank in telling the public just what has transpired in the past, or just what is contemplated in the future; fact is, we have put the soft pedal on these activities. A reading of the testimony at the time of the last hearings shows much off-the-record conversation from which it might be assumed that testimony of a confidential nature was given.

Not only is there a demand for a closer scrutiny of lend-lease operations by the public, but last week from the other side of this Capitol came statements that the entire program be examined and appraised with a view to protecting our national interest. We can no longer

acquiesce in a "hush-hush" approach to a program so important to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it has been charged that lend-lease supplies sent by this country to Great Britain are being distributed by the British as their own products, breeding good will for them and laying the basis for future trade. Further, it is charged that funds under this program are used to build expensive air bases with no right for us to use them after the war. And again, it is alleged that some of our Allies use our petroleum supplies while they hoard their own. It is further charged that this Nation's course to date has created among foreign nations the expectation of gifts and favors under lend-lease far beyond our capacity to confer. And that is the very thought, Mr. Speaker, that is uppermost in the minds of our people today—the impression that we have promised to give away our very substance under this program.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that this Congress clear the atmosphere on this important matter. To that end, I have today introduced a resolution asking for the appointment of a special committee to make a full and complete investigation of all operations carried out by the various departments and agencies of Government under the so-called lend-lease law. It aims to determine, among other things:

First. The extent of goods and services, civil and military supplied to date, in dollars and cents, and the recipients thereof;

Second. The extent of goods and services, civil and military, received by the United States, in dollars and cents, and from whom received;

Third. Whether the transactions constitute a debt against the recipients or outright gifts;

Fourth. Whether such operations are carried out in an efficient and economic manner and with due regard to the best interests and welfare of the citizens of the United States; and

Fifth. Whether such operations have in every case promoted the defense of the United States.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I want to congratulate the gentleman for introducing his resolution because it is beginning to dawn upon the American people that on his first visit to America Mr. Churchill took our coat back to England, on his second visit he took our pants, on the third visit he took our underwear, and before we get out of this mess he will skin us out of our hide.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this country has been and is on a spending spree unparalleled in its history, and the appropriations for lend-lease constitute a large part of it. The original appropriation in March 1941 was \$7,000,000,000. Since then sixty-five billion has been appropriated, and obligations to date are approximately \$25,000,000,000. It is apparent that taxes and more taxes, from the rich and from the poor, are required. Constituents realize that spending means taxing and

they want to know about the effect of this huge debt upon our economy. Few of them believe in the philosophy that a large public debt is a national asset. In fact, they fully realize that debt without the ability to pay leads to national bankruptcy. So today we owe it to those who fight and those who labor to protect them against insolvency. We have heard a great deal about the "four freedoms," one of which is freedom from fear. It has been suggested that we add a fifth freedom, to wit, "freedom from insolvency." Until ways and means are devised to insure against that possibility there can be no real freedom from fear.

Mr. Speaker, we shall soon be considering an appropriation for lend-lease, and I submit that the hearings authorized by my resolution should be held before that time so that this House can have the benefit of the findings and conclusions of the committee. It is my opinion that unless the people of our country are given all the facts about the lend-lease program the writing of the peace may be in jeopardy, at least our relationship with our allies may be seriously impaired. The people are insisting upon the truth and nothing but the truth at this time.

I respectfully ask that my resolution receive favorable consideration by the proper committee, and that it be presented to the House as soon as possible for action.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, being one of two Democrats on the floor, I will yield to the gentleman gladly.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 307, Rept. No. 745), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct an investigation and study of such matters related to present and probable future conditions and developments in and affecting air navigation and domestic and foreign air commerce as it may deem advisable.

The committee, as a whole or by subcommittee, shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations for legislation as it may deem advisable.

The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to conduct such investigation and study at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting,

has recessed, or has adjourned, as it deems necessary; except that in conducting such investigation and study outside the United States or at any place in the United States away from the seat of government such committee shall act by a subcommittee of not more than 11 members.

WOULD THEY BETRAY THE AMERICAN FIGHTING MAN?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Stalin insists that every Russian shall fight for the security, the preservation, of the United States of Soviet Republics. He is acknowledged the world over as the one man who will brook no interference with the interests of his country. Those who from without would destroy the sovereignty of his empire are battled to the death. Those within who fail to adopt and to carry out the slogan, Russia First, are shot or sent to Siberia.

With determination which no one can doubt, Churchill frankly announces that he did not become "the King's first minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." It is his fixed purpose that where flies the British flag, there it shall remain. When this war is over and the peace has been made, it will be found that the Union Jack, the flag of the British Empire, waves over more territory, a greater area of the earth's surface, than ever before.

Because of his loyalty to the British Empire; because he can see no interests but the interest of the British Empire; because he has been able, by flattery and cajolery, to induce other peoples and other nations to serve Britain's interests; because he has no other thought than the preservation and the extension of the British Empire, Churchill has been acclaimed as one of the world's greatest statesmen.

His most recent major service to the Empire culminated with our entry into the war and that, he said, "is what I have dreamed of, aimed at, and worked for and now it has come to pass."

Stalin and Churchill, because each thinks of the interests of no country other than his own; because the whole interest of each lies in the advancement of his own homeland; because neither will do anything to aid any other nation if it interferes with the prosperity and advancement of his own people, are praised the wide world over, acclaimed by all people as the world's two greatest patriots.

But here in America those who place love of country, faith in her institutions, confidence in her people, make her independence and her continued existence their first thought, are branded as creators of disunity, charged with a lack of loyalty.

Why is it that those acts, those efforts for the preservation of our Government, of our methods, of our prosperity and our happiness, which, when exerted by other nationals in the interests of their governments, are so highly praised, should be here condemned?

And who is it that here condemns those who insist, as do Stalin and Churchill, that one's own country comes first?

What weakness of mind, what lack of good sense and judgment, what doubt

of the courage of our fighting men, what want of confidence in our Constitution and our form of government, what inferiority complex, what lack of faith in our people and the righteousness of their purpose impels those who loudly and continuously denounce those who proudly, fearlessly pledge loyalty first to America?

Only since the coming of the spenders of other people's money and sustenance, only since the arrival of the wasters, only since the supremacy of the little dictators and tyrants of the O. P. A. and its blood brothers, only since the ascendancy of the power of the crackpots, the fuzzy-wuzzy thinkers, the overrunning of the Nation's Capital by those who, fed and clothed by our Government, seek to remake America, have the patriotic, loyal Americans, those who believe in the America of today, who have faith in the America of tomorrow, had leveled at them such vile, false charges as are now appearing in print.

One purpose of these false charges is to intimidate those who insist that loyalty to our country, protection of our national interests and integrity should be our first concern.

Another objective is to destroy the system of private enterprise which renders the individual secure in his home life, in his civil affairs, in his means and manner of earning a livelihood and establishing security for his old age; enables him to be free and independent of a tyrannical, dictatorial government.

Still another purpose is to destroy us as a nation, make us but a part of an international state.

That intimidation of those who oppose the New Deal—more recently, the fourth term—brought about by the fear of the Government, is one of the means of the administration to perpetuate itself, is shown by the arbitrary and unconstitutional rules, orders, and directives issued and enforced by an army of snoopers and petty tyrants.

On every hand throughout this broad land of ours, the heretofore free and independent citizen is met by a Government agent armed with a so-called order from some executive department. That order all too often is an arbitrary one, serves no good purpose; on the contrary, renders production, the prosecution of the war effort, more difficult.

Proof that the efforts of the administration are destroying our way of life can be found at every crossroad throughout the land, where some individual has had his means of livelihood lessened by an administrative directive.

That the purpose is to surrender our independence and make us a part of a superworld government, which our taxpayers will be required to support, to which and at whose command the sons, the husbands, the daughters of our people will be sent to police and maintain order, was shown by the propaganda on which appeared the name of Secretary of the Interior Ickes and Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts, which came to the desks of Senators and Congressmen late in January of 1942.

That plan, in no unmistakable terms, called for the surrender of our inde-

pendence, the substitution in lieu thereof of a declaration of interdependence upon other nations of the world. It called for the hauling down of the Stars and Stripes and for the replacement of that flag by the mongrel flag of the united nations of the world.

Ever since Franklin D. Roosevelt became obsessed with the idea that he was the indispensable man, that surrounding him were supermen and master minds, the taxpayer's money has been used to further his political interests.

His stock in trade has been the use of the taxpayer's money to grant special privileges to one group after another. He has protected other groups in their lawlessness and disregard of constitutional provisions and, throughout it all, he has attempted to purge those members of his own party who disagreed with his policies; and his political adversaries in other parties have been consistently smeared and charged with disloyalty.

For absurdity, inaccuracy, and misjudgment of American sentiment and thinking, as well as for false and vicious propaganda, a recent article in the Washington Post by William L. Shirer was typical.

It is in line with the policy of the Washington Post, whose editor has unceasingly condemned and challenged the motives, the loyalty, and the patriotism of all those who have ventured to place the interests of America above those of any individual, race, people, or nation.

There are those who, as in the days of old, worship false idols. Then the god might be a graven image. Today it may be either love of gold, worship at the feet of international financiers, or love of pomp and show; desire to bask in the smile of some prince or king or queen; to be knighted, made a member of the British royalty.

There are those who, having obtained freedom of speech, freedom from fear, freedom from want, and freedom of religious worship here in this country and under our form of government, now disavow all loyalty to the country, which gives them the opportunity to eat, prosper, and be happy; who seek to surrender our sovereignty, make us a subject nation.

They are not America firsters, they are America seconders, or, more accurately, America lasters. They think of their country only after and when they have thought of and promoted the interests of other countries, other peoples.

Because the article by Shirer is so typical of the absurd, stupid—yes, vicious—propaganda put out by the anti-Americans, let us take a glance at his story.

It is evident that the article was written before the return and report of the five Senators who toured the war front. Evidently Mr. Shirer was too tired to rewrite it to make it conform to the fact after their report.

Their report substantiates in every particular the charges of those who are smeared because they place America first.

That report shows beyond argument that Great Britain is extending its commercial empire at our expense. It shows that Russia continues to deny us bases

in the east from which we could get at Japan.

It is apparent from that report that our Nation is being stripped of its natural resources for the benefit of the British. Especially is this true with reference to oil.

Mr. Shirer headed his article, "Isolationist strategy, a warning in time."

We all agree that war is wicked and wasteful. He and those who agree with him then jump to the assumption that war can be prevented if we join with certain nations and fight a war to preserve the peace whenever some race or nation may refuse to obey the orders of the international group of which we are a member.

The fact that throughout history world alliances, combinations of nations to preserve peace, have not prevented war is blandly ignored.

The experience of the ages is brushed aside, and egotistically it is proclaimed that we, with Great Britain, Russia, and China, can accomplish that which no other group of nations has ever been able to bring about.

The America Seconders would perform an international marriage ceremony, giving us at least three husbands or wives, when two of the three, Britain and Russia, through their spokesmen, Churchill and Stalin, have announced clearly, and in all apparent sincerity, that no international marriage shall interfere with the interest of either Great Britain or Russia.

Because Mr. Shirer expresses so well the thought of those who would surrender our sovereignty, let me quote. He writes:

As a people, I think we have two weak spots in this regard. We do not like the idea of giving up an iota of our sovereignty to any world organization. And we have an almost grotesque fear of being done in by slick allies, especially the British and the Russians.

Read that again.

So dislike of giving up an iota of our sovereignty is a weakness, is it? Suggest that thought to Stalin or to Churchill. And the "fear of being done in by slick allies, especially the British and the Russians" is grotesque, is it, Mr. Shirer?

When we remember how, after the last war, to the winning of which we contributed so much; when we recall how our men went in when Britain was on the verge of defeat, and at the cost of their lives saved France and Britain from defeat and how after the war was over, in spite of our contributions of men and of money, we were branded as a Shylock, is there any reason why we should not expect to again be "done in"? When we recall that we were told that lend-lease would be repaid to us in money or in kind and that it was but a loan and not a gift, and now we learn that no reimbursement is to be made, are we not being "done in"?

When we know, as now we do, that materials contributed by us to Britain are being reexported by her to other countries as gifts from her, not from us, are we not being "done in"? When we learn, as we have learned, that our money and our materials which our people are denying themselves are being used to

build harbors and wharves and stock houses and factories and airfields in almost every land throughout the world and that those facilities will be used by our trade competitors after the war is over, while we are denied their use, are we not being "done in"?

So today the American manufacturers, the American workman, who support this administration and ask a fourth term for F. D. R., will awaken to the realization that the factories which we are building in foreign lands will be operated by cheap foreign labor and that the job of the American worker will be done in a foreign land, while he seeks work on a Government made job. The export trade of the manufacturer will be lost to the factory operating abroad.

Done in, yes we are being done in and sold out by those who lack confidence in the American people, in the American form of government, in our Constitution.

Shirer writes that the people are at the mercy of a minority, which he says may by "legislative trickery and connivance" defeat the will of the people. Then he called attention to the arguments which the so-called minority has used. He writes:

Listen, for example, to Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan. The Fulbright resolution, he said in the debate, "means but one thing, that we repeal the Declaration of Independence . . . if we agree in setting up such international machinery we are, to all intents and purposes, surrendering a portion of our national sovereignty . . . we shall not be masters of the situation . . . we may find ourselves, to our sorrow, in the position of an Australia, New Zealand, or Canada—a royal province, back once more under the Union Jack instead of the Stars and Stripes . . . Is there any reason . . . why we shall be ashamed of the proposition that we are for America first? . . . Our forefathers brought forth the Declaration of Independence."

Well may I ask Mr. Shirer, what is wrong with that argument? It is largely a statement of fact. The propaganda put out by World Fellowship and Federal Union and the material which came to the desks of Senators and Congressmen on the 27th of January 1942, and the proposition which was endorsed by Harold Ickes and by Justice Owen J. Roberts called for the surrender of our independence, a declaration of an interdependence. It called for the hauling down of our flag and the substitution of another flag. That program demanded that we surrender a part of our sovereignty; that we join with other nations and abide by the joint decree of those nations.

Now I ask, Mr. Shirer, and any and all of those who agree with you on this move to enter into an international supergovernment, what is wrong with the proposition that we stand for America first? In view of the fact that Stalin is for Russia, Churchill for Britain first, tell me just why I should not be for America first?

Continuing, Mr. Shirer writes:

Today, Mr. Hoffman continues, "Great Britain is extending her commercial empire while we furnish the sinews of war and aid in financing her international trade."

Does anyone with a knowledge of the facts today doubt that Great Britain is extending her commercial empire, while we furnish the sinews of war and aid in financing her international trade?

If Mr. Shirer does not know that fact, let him read the statements of the three Democratic Senators, of the two Republican Senators, who just returned from a trip to the battle front.

Then he refers to those who oppose a super world government, of which we should be but a part. The article gives this subhead, "They forget the Yankee trader," and under it is this paragraph:

The sequel is that if we get into an international organization, we shall certainly lose our shirt if not our pants. It seems to this writer that if these gentlemen had ever seen the shrewd Yankee trader dealing with the "slick" Europeans, they would lose their weird and hardly justifiable inferiority complex. Or is it merely a good demagogic talking point which many Americans, our background being what it is, easily fall for?

We do not need to get into the permanent international organization to be certain that we are not only losing our shirt but our pants, and may I add, Mr. Shirer, if we continue, we will lose our shoes and socks, and we will be lucky if our toenails are not pulled out.

Are you and your fellow advocates of America last, so ignorant of the fact that you do not know that we are already on the paying end of the war? Take a trip out into the country and see the farmer, who, for example, is unable to buy a wrench or a pair of pliers, necessities on every farm, and then finds in a catalog published in England that British manufacturers have both for export.

We know now from the reports of the returning Senators that we are losing our pants as well as our shirts in our international deals. We know now that our farmers are going without much of the machinery which is needed in the war effort. While that machinery—yes; and complete factories—is exported to other countries.

The Yankee trader to whom Mr. Shirer refers is but a myth. If there is one in evidence today, he will be found down in the Smithsonian. He has been succeeded by a Harry Hopkins, by a HENRY WALLACE, each big-hearted and generous with other people's money. Hopkins, if he had his way, would supervise at the expense of the American worker, farmer, and businessman, a world-wide glorified W. P. A. Not only would he rake leaves, put shoes on and feed everyone, but he would set the Hot-tentot and the Bushman to sweeping up the waves of the ocean with paper brooms and pay them with American dollars.

WALLACE would be a little more practical. He would give, he first thought, 1 quart, but later reduced it to a pint, a pint of milk to everyone everywhere. He hasn't yet determined whether he would send it in glass or paper containers, or whether, accompanying each pint to the tropical countries, an electrical refrigerator with a power plant to keep it cool would go.

Writes Shirer:

Representative HAMILTON FISH, who was in favor of the resolution, spoke in the same vein. "The time has come," said he, "for some of us at least to take an American view of our foreign policies." That will be the propaganda line. America First!

So you think, Mr. Shirer, that the time has not come when some of us should take an American view of our foreign policy. So you believe that this is not the time when we should pledge our loyalty first to America? Would you also do away with the pledge to the flag? You think, do you, that it is not now time to save the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence for the soldiers who will return? Apparently you have plenty of company—others who would sell America short.

It is quite evident from the arguments made in the press and elsewhere that there are those who would remake, as HENRY WALLACE advocates, America. There are those who hope as Tugwell said, that we can destroy the American system of business and that the process may not be too bloody.

Let me suggest to Mr. Shirer and those who think with him that they go out into the highways and the byways, into the small cities, the towns, the cross-roads, and there suggest to the businessmen, to the farmers, and to the workers, who have sacrificed to aid in the prosecution of the war; who have bought bonds; who are struggling along as best they may to do their utmost in support of our fighting men, that America does not come first; that we are fighting the war for Britain or for Russia or for China.

Let him suggest that we should not save the Constitution, that we should not adhere to the Declaration of Independence; that the time has not arrived for us to take an American view of our foreign policy. Do that, Mr. Shirer, or any of you who believe as he apparently does, and then come back, if you can, and tell us of the reaction.

One more line from Mr. Shirer. He quotes WILLIAM LEMKE as having said during the debate:

"Uncle Sam is not going to be a perpetual Santa Claus. They (our returning troops) will never substitute a mongrel flag for the Stars and Stripes."

And then Shirer writes this:

Those will be the beautiful words, nicely wrapped up for the American people in red, white and blue to disguise their enormous emptiness and meaninglessness.

So you believe, do you, Mr. Shirer, that the statement that our returning fighting men will never substitute a mongrel flag for the Stars and Stripes is empty and meaningless?

Now, you tell that to the boys who are about to take off in a bomber, knowing full well that they may go down in flaming death or be cast adrift to die of hunger or of thirst on a blistering ocean.

You go down, Mr. Shirer, to the boys who are fighting not only the Japs but loneliness and sickness in the South Sea Islands, and tell them that America, the homeland, does not come first. You tell them that the statement that the Stars and Stripes shall not be hauled down does not mean anything.

You tell the war-weary boys in Africa, in Sicily, in Italy, that the Stars and Stripes under which they fight is but a rag and is to be replaced by the flag of some international organization.

You go, Mr. Shirer, to the mothers and the fathers, the wives and the sweet-hearts, of the men who are fighting this war, and tell them that their sons and husbands and brothers are not fighting for home, for fireside, for America.

Go, if you will, Mr. Shirer, into the homes which have received that little slip of paper telling that a loved one has been lost in battle or is missing in action, and take with you, instead of the Stars and Stripes, which the House last week voted should be given to the parents of every man who lost his life in this war, the mongrel flag referred to by the gentleman from North Dakota, WILLIAM LEMKE.

To Mr. Shirer and to all those who think so little of our liberty, our independence, our freedom, our prosperity, and the happiness which was ours before this war, that they would subordinate our interests to the interests of other nations, to a group of international bankers and power politicians, who, after each war, have financed the rearmament of nations bent on war, let me say that there are millions of Americans who believe first in America, who do not propose to be intimidated and that, if need demands, they will fight here at home to maintain our independence and our sovereignty.

Millions of Americans, when they recite the pledge to the flag, mean it. They are for America first. They believe in the America of today; they believe in the America of tomorrow and they intend that, down through the ages, shall go an America willing in the future as in the past to help every unfortunate people, unfortunate nation, but an America free and independent.

EXHIBIT A.

ISOLATIONIST STRATEGY, A WARNING IN TIME (By William L. Shirer)

The American people are pretty much agreed, as the House debate and vote on the Fulbright resolution the other day showed, that unless this Republic takes a hand in preserving the peace, this sorry world will be in for another war 20 to 30 years hence and the sons of the veterans of this war, the grandsons of the veterans of the last one, will once more have to give up the decent life of peace to die bloodily on a battlefield.

And yet the curious propaganda of a small but vocal group of our politicians and their press lords plus what Representative RAY J. MADDEN of Indiana, in describing Senator LODGE's fight against this league, called "legislative trickery and connivance," may yet combine to rob us and our children of the chance to live for more than a dozen or two years in the dignity and decency of peace.

Few of my generation are aware, and our elders probably have forgotten, that Senator JAMES E. WATSON, the floor leader in the Senate fight against the league, admitted privately at the time, 80 percent of the American people were for the league.

There seems little doubt that an equal percentage today favors our participation in some sort of international machinery with the power to maintain the peace. But if 80 percent of the people could be double-crossed and fooled after the last war, it would be naive to believe that it cannot happen again.

WE ARE AT MERCY OF THE MINORITY

If there is "legislative trickery and connivance" this time, there is little that you and I can do about it. We are, after all, at the mercy of a minority in the Senate, as we were in 1919-20.

Against the flood of propaganda that will surely flow, we are not so helpless. We know already the line it will take. The remarkable debate on the Fulbright resolution in the House showed us pretty well how the spokesmen of the bitter-end isolationists will talk. It demonstrated that their propaganda will be cunningly directed at the most vulnerable points in the mental armor of our American citizenry.

As a people, I think, we have two weak spots in this regard. We do not like the idea of giving up an iota of our sovereignty to any world organization. And we have an almost grotesque fear of being done in by slick allies, especially the British and the Russians.

It was on these points mainly that the opponents of the Fulbright resolution concentrated their peculiar wrath.

Since the American press cannot—or at least does not—report adequately the debates in Congress and not one citizen in a hundred thousand reads that revealing journal, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which does report them down to the last word it might be enlightening to investigate a little more fully than has been done in the arguments of those who opposed Mr. FULBRIGHT's resolution calling upon American participation in "appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain just and lasting peace."

For they are the gentlemen who will be in the vanguard of the fight to "save the Republic" and "preserve the Constitution" by staying out of "foreign entanglements" when the time comes to try to organize the peace.

WHAT CLARE HOFFMAN HAS TO SAY

Listen, for example, to Representative CLARE HOFFMAN of Michigan. The Fulbright resolution, he said in the debate, "means but one thing, that we repeal the Declaration of Independence . . . if we agree in setting up such international machinery we are, to all intents and purposes, surrendering a portion of our national sovereignty . . . we shall not be masters of the situation . . . we may find ourselves to our sorrow, in the position of an Australia, New Zealand, or Canada—a royal province, back once more under the Union Jack instead of the Stars and Stripes . . . Is there any reason . . . why we should be ashamed of the proposition that we are for America first? . . . Our forefathers brought forth the Declaration of Independence," etc.

Britain becomes the real villain to Mr. HOFFMAN as well as to most of the other speakers against the resolution.

"Today," Mr. HOFFMAN continues, "Great Britain is extending her commercial empire while we furnish the sinews of war and aid in financing her international trade."

But Representative HOFFMAN is perhaps mild on the subject compared to the Congresswoman from Illinois, Miss JESSIE SUMNER. She told the Congress that " . . . England is now hated from one end of the world to the other . . . English . . . want to finish this war richer than they were when they got into it—at American expense. In addition they want us to give up our independence by joining an alliance which will throw us into every war they fight. They are going too far."

WHO AFTER ALL STARTED THE WAR?

It seemed strange to this reporter, pouring through the voluminous pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to find that some speakers in the debate still implied that the United States—and not Germany and Japan—was

responsible for this country entering the war.

Thus Representative HOFFMAN: "Well did we know, when we sent munitions of war through belligerent waters to one of the warring nations, that war would follow. . . ." Representative WALTER E. BREHM, of Ohio: " . . . If we had been strong internally and had not been so anxious to furnish the munitions of war to countries which we knew were preparing for war, just for the sake of amassing fortunes in this country, we would not be at war today."

This may sound like bilge—but one need not be a prophet to predict that we will hear much more of the like when the discussions of peace come up.

And there will be cries of "danger" and "revolution." Representative SUMNER of Illinois opened her speech by saying: "I consider the Fulbright resolution the most dangerous bill ever presented to an American Congress."

Representative FREDERICK C. SMITH, of Ohio, thought that "there are too many unknown factors at this juncture to safely undertake the formulation of so far-reaching and revolutionary a policy as this would involve."

Throughout the speeches of the extreme isolationists was threaded the curious argument—of which we shall certainly hear a great deal more—that while Winston Churchill and Joseph Stalin are always looking out for the interests of their own countries first, our leaders are bashful about looking out for American interests first.

THEY FORGET THE YANKEE TRADER

The sequel is that if we get into an international organization we shall certainly lose our shirt if not our pants. It seems to this writer that if these gentlemen had ever seen the shrewd Yankee trader dealing with the "slick" Europeans, they would lose their weird and hardly justifiable inferiority complex. Or is it merely a good demagogic talking point which many Americans, our background being what it is, easily fall for?

Representative ROBERT B. CHIPFIELD, of Illinois, though supporting the Fulbright resolution, had his suspicions on this subject. He asked: "Has not the time arrived when we should begin to beware of the kind of man who is 'a steady patriot of the world alone, the friend of every country but his own'?"

Representative JOHN M. ROBISON, of Kentucky, who also supported the resolution, said: "We knew that those in charge of the present administration are strongly inclined toward internationalism. Instead of placing the welfare of our own country first, many other countries are first in their thinking."

Representative HAMILTON FISH, who was in favor of the resolution, spoke in the same vein. "The time has come," said he, "for some of us at least to take an American view of our foreign policies."

That will be the propaganda line. America First! Save the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence! Don't sell America out to the perfidious British or the Red Bolsheviks! In the immortal words of Representative WILLIAM LEMKE, "Uncle Sam is not going to be a perpetual Santa Claus. . . . They (our returning troops) will never substitute a mongrel flag for the Stars and Stripes."

Those will be the beautiful words, nicely wrapped up for the American people in red, white, and blue to disguise their enormous emptiness and meaninglessness. Those will be the words to watch, the propaganda catchwords that will try to trick us out of another honest attempt to make peace endure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California

[Mr. POULSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE OIL SITUATION

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, since the return of the five Senators who have made a round-the-world trip of the war zones, we have heard considerable discussion about the fact that the United States is supplying over 65 percent of the oil for the war, and as a result is dwindling its oil reserves to a very dangerous position. We only own and control 20 percent of the known oil reserve of the world. At the same time they have stated that our ally, Great Britain, has access to the great Persian oil fields and is not contributing its share. Inasmuch as this subject has been brought to the forefront, I consider it a very opportune time to make some further inquiries into this general oil situation, and I address my questions publicly to Brig. Gen. Walter Pyron and Capt. A. F. Carter, representing the Navy on what is known as the Army-Navy Petroleum Board. With the impending cut in gasoline usage on the west coast due to the shifting of the war emphasis to the Pacific area, it becomes more imperative than ever that we should explore all known sources of oil within our control.

The question I ask bluntly is this: Why has the Board asked for and received appropriations running in excess of \$100,000,000 for the purpose of exploiting, or what is commonly known as wildcatting and prospecting in the most remote and inaccessible part of northern Canada not only in behalf of Canada but in behalf of private enterprise known as the Imperial Oil Co.? They have done this wildcatting with the provision that in the event further oil is discovered we will still pay for it at the regular market price and we have no rights to it whatever, and all title and interest is retained by the Canadian Government and the Imperial Oil Co. Now, this wildcatting with American money for the benefit of our allies would not be so questionable were it not for the fact that the prospecting of the area suggested has been restricted to an established but to date limited productive portion of a comparatively remote oil area lying wholly outside of American territory, while the economically attractive United States naval reserve within 400 miles of the industrial center of Alaska, Fairbanks, northern terminal of the military highway, remains untested.

If our Government had been as enterprising and had used the same initiative in exploring and developing our Alaskan naval reserve as it had in establishing the air route and Alaska military highway, the results could have been at least as much and probably more than attained in the Canadian venture.

For those who are not acquainted with this Canadian venture, I would like to

discuss some of the high lights. This is known as the Fort Norman wells. The Norman wells area is situated about 1,000 miles north of Edmonton, Alberta. It was necessary to build a road to reach this oil area because the original transportation was over the most nonpassable muskeg terrain known in the Alaskan regions. A pipe line also had to be built from the Norman wells to White Horse on the military highway.

After years of development, plus the recent vigorous efforts, the Norman wells have proven to be an inadequate source of oil for the prevailing needs of our northern theater of operations. According to reports turned in to the Navy by well-informed geologists, this territory has never compared with our own Alaskan oil reserve.

The question I ask this Army-Navy Petroleum Board is why it has not spent some of our money exploiting and wildcatting in our own oil reserve where we will retain all interest and title if and when we discover oil?

The reports of different and competent oil experts show that this Alaskan territory has favorable geologic, climatic, and geographic factors. Furthermore, it is within our boundaries. It is favorable for present military necessity and there are chances of obtaining a greater volume of oil than is at present produced in Canadian territory or can be anticipated from this district.

Northwestern Alaska located as it is in the path of the new short air route to Asia definitely becomes a desirable spot for oil development, and then realizing that it has those requisites certainly should command the attention and respect of our leaders to the extent that exploration should be made in this territory. The objection previously used was that it was inaccessible for want of transportation, but with the development of the airplane and air transportation this argument has been removed. On the affirmative side is the fact that the development of air transportation has definitely increased the need for petroleum reserves in this identical region.

I want to again refer you to a letter placed in the RECORD on February 26 from a man with a record in the oil game equal to the best, and who has sufficient world-wide experience in oil. I also refer you to a report turned in to the Navy Department and the Office of the Budget. At this point, I also want to again point out that the Japanese are fully aware of these possibilities, and furthermore much of this information can be found in our libraries in the Geological Surveys. I am submitting herewith a memorandum which I have received from an official source:

Subject: Importance of United States Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 to the present and post-war economic development of northwestern Alaska.

United States Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, situated in the northwestern part of Alaska, is an area roughly rectangular in shape with its long axis trending east-west and extending from Icy Cape in the west to the mouth of the Colville River in the east.

After a detailed reconnaissance geologic study of the reserve over a period of 4 years,

evidence of the most positive and critical nature discovered was that of the live seepages of naphthalene base oil issuing at Cape Simpson and Dease Inlet near Barrow. The results of this exploration also cast considerable light on the stratigraphic aspect and structure of the terrain underlying the reserve. The various data showed evidence that the rocks contain petroleum, presumably at intervals throughout a thickness of at least 8,000 feet.

The areal extent of the reserve is 35,000 square miles, of which at least one-fourth (southern mountainous part) is decidedly not of the type usually associated with oil areas of economic interest. This unattractive part of the reserve, one of severe folding with a narrow zone of intrusives, is adjacent to the Brooks Range thrust fault.

It may also be considered neutralized by a more attractive area of approximately 3,000 square miles lying immediately to the west and contiguous with the western boundary of the reserve, and another large area on the trend east between the Colville and Canning Rivers.

Adhering strictly to the terminology applied to petroliferous regions, this 35,000-square-mile area does not qualify, as yet, to carry the appellation "petroleum reserve." Only the results of an adequate test with the drilling of at least one carefully spotted location will tell whether the area in question is truly a petroleum reserve.

In either domestic or foreign oil development, it is an established fact that with an attractive-looking, but untested region of this character, the practice employed by the major oil companies is preliminary structure searching, with a subsequent test of the most favorable looking structure. This task may be accomplished by a systematic prospecting campaign in search of a structural trap. With the known structural trends of the area and key reference horizons discovered by previous study, a group of four 1-inch rotocore drills would readily accomplish the job. Three or four north-south sections of shallow holes in the region adjacent, and to the west of the seepage area, should supply sufficient information with which to spot the initial test of the reserve. In this region of gentle unbroken folds and a sequence of relatively conformable strata, geophysical prospecting is considered unnecessary.

The structure-prospecting program, which invariably precedes the oil test, would require that the light portable rotocore equipment and its operating crews be hauled to the area by air transport. This prospecting operation should be consummated and a well location made by the time the big-hole drilling equipment arrives by water transport. The latter equipment would have to be shipped by shallow draft barge via Bering Strait to Wainwright or Barrow during the months of July and August.

During the present crisis, and that impending in the Dutch Harbor-western Aleutian area, with such a limited supply of oil (Fort Norman), and that at a relatively great distance from the north Pacific, Aleutians, Bering Sea, and the Kotzebue Sound-Lisburne regions, it is necessary for the Navy to test and develop immediately any promising-looking oil area with a consequent less severe problem of logistics.

On the basis of comparison with neighboring oil-bearing areas, for example, the McKenzie delta region and Fort Norman to the east, the Cold Bay-Aleutian region, and the Katalla area, the No. 4 reserve, although still untested, is outstanding for the various reasons as enumerated below:

1. The entire production of the Fort Norman area does not exceed at capacity 3,000 barrels of oil a day. This volume is from a system of some 20 wells located in an area well over 500 miles from tidewater. Normally

production of such volume is considered of minor importance and, except under stress of great necessity, would never warrant the construction of a 500-mile pipe line over extremely mountainous terrain.

Conversely, if an initial test of reserve No. 4 near Barrow or Wainwright proved an oil area of even moderate importance, a pipe line could be readily laid along the Chip-John-Ray Valley route via Livengood to Fairbanks, most important industrial and farming district in central Alaska. Fairbanks, with its intensive mining activities, has outlet to the Pacific by two major routes, the Alaskan Railroad to Seward and the Richardson Highway to Valdez, and a third to the Bering Sea by river craft via the Yukon. Moreover, should reserve No. 4 produce with only mediocre volume, the fact that the fields are at tidewater with 3 months' shipping season is of tremendous importance, both economically and strategically. In this respect reserve No. 4 has an alternative in the case of sabotage or bombing of the pipe line, while the Norman-Whitehorse line has none. With shallow draft barges, during a 3-month period, a fleet of 30 small shallow draft tanker barges could establish a formidable reserve at various strategic localities between the Diomed Islands and the Aleutians. The latter condition appears worthy of further investigation.

No other areas of promising oil possibilities are known to exist north of the Turner Valley, Alberta fields.

2. Aleutian-Kodiak area: Due to the presence of volcanics, nearby intrusives, severe folding, faulting, and related disturbed zones, this area is not considered favorable to accumulation of oil in commercial quantities. Although seepage evidence is present, adequate tests of the region have all been of a negative nature.

3. Katalla: Oil occurs in fractured zones rather than in true structure with normal sand conditions. Commercial production in this field is of nominal importance.

Since the very event for which U. S. Naval Reserve No. 4 was established has now arrived—war in the Pacific—it is readily apparent that necessary steps should be taken immediately to prospect and test the most promising looking areas in Reserve No. 4.

The structural prospecting and drilling of one, preferably two, test wells of adequate depth (at least 6,000 feet) could be accomplished with a gross expenditure not to exceed \$1,000,000.

Operational conditions in general are not nearly so severe as those of the Shelby-Cut-bank region of Montana, nor those of Turner Valley, Alberta; the maximum temperature range at Barrow is from 50° to 90°. There are neither mountains nor glaciers, little snow, and less than 6 inches annual precipitation.

Development of Reserve No. 4 would, by solving the fuel problem in Alaska, unquestionably be one of the most conspicuous events of our post-war planning.

The surface terrain overlying the presumed oil series from Cape Lisburne to the Canning River, east of Barrow, also contains one of the richest workable series of high rank bituminous coal on the North American Continent. There are no major bituminous coal deposits on the Pacific slope. All coal distributed for Bering Sea (Nome) and lower Yukon consumption is imported at great cost from the bituminous fields of Colorado and Wyoming. Fuel oil and gasoline for the Seward Peninsula gold dredging and related mining operations is transported 3,000 miles from the California fields. Naval Reserve No. 4 is less than 500 miles distant from Nome by water route.

If Reserve No. 4 were tested and found to contain petroleum in commercial quantities, the Navy could have the option of produc-

ing and refining their oil, or, as is their practice elsewhere, of turning it over to capable private oil producers and refiners. Once the initial test has been made and financial risk eliminated, private interests would welcome the opportunity to develop, produce, and supply Alaskan industries with Alaskan oil.

To summarize, it appears that production of oil in this region would not only be of considerable strategic importance, but would also greatly stimulate the opening of economically potent northwestern and central Alaska to post-war exploitation and commerce. It is well known that basic metals in continental United States are rapidly being depleted. Alaska, a natural reservoir of most of these metals, has, because of the prohibitive price of fuel (oil and steam coal), remained largely undeveloped. However, if Reserve No. 4 is tested and develops into a producing oil area, the mining of basic metals in Alaska would unquestionably become of great importance to the internal economy of Alaska.

If oil is developed in Naval Reserve No. 4, the effect on the industrial development of Alaska would be comprehensible only to one who is familiar with the industrial possibilities of northwestern Alaska and the great Yukon Basin.

Mr. Speaker, in line with the necessity for additional oil, it does seem that the board should at least give serious immediate consideration to the exploitation and testing of the Alaskan naval reserve area. This is a subject for investigation by the proper committees in this House. At the same time investigation should be made of corporate connections of the Imperial Oil Co.

TAXATION AND APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 6 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, the membership of both branches of the Congress are very much disturbed because of the recommendation of the Treasury Department asking for an enormous increase in the levying of taxes on the citizenship of this country for the next fiscal year—a program which, if the Congress should adopt, will be absolutely confiscatory. In fact, if any increase should be levied by the Congress, it will have practically the same result.

The old adage is "the power to tax is the power to destroy." Every nation that launched itself on a spending and wasteful program to the extent it was necessary to levy taxes out of line and not commensurate with the income of the public, created revolutions and chaos. History alone reveals their once existence.

This Nation started that program 10 years ago; it has reached the stage today under the guise of the successful prosecution of the conflict we are now engaged in that the amounts asked for and appropriated by the Congress are such stupendous sums that it is impossible for the minds of the ordinary person to visualize.

We have appropriated already for the fiscal year July 1, 1943, to July 1, 1944, more than four times the entire cost of World War No. 1. In fact, in the past

3 years we have appropriated and authorized over \$325,000,000,000—an inconceivable sum of money. The total debt of the allies of our country, many of which have been engaged in World War No. 2 for the past 4 years, only equals about the amount we appropriated in 1 year—\$125,000,000,000.

We are appropriating for this year alone an amount that exceeds the entire Axis debt by at least \$20,000,000,000.

It is impossible for 130,000,000 people to withstand this continued avalanche of a drain on their daily earnings. If we continue an expenditure of moneys for the next 3 or 4 years as we have in the past few years, and the signs of the times point to similar requests, our national debt will be four hundred to five hundred billion dollars, which will be at least 10 to 40 percent more than our entire national wealth.

Mr. Speaker, I am just calling the House's attention to this trend, with a view that its membership and especially the Appropriations Committee, will heed the Stop, look, and listen sign and begin to investigate just what is being done by the administration with these enormous sums that the Congress has blindly given them to spend.

I am of the opinion that the amount of money already appropriated this year, if judiciously expended and the waste eliminated, will last every department insofar as our war effort is concerned in carrying on for at least another 2 years.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGEHEE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman favor an inquiry as to what has been done with lend-lease money, with the view of curtailing further expenditure of that money, or seeing that it goes into proper channels?

Mr. McGEHEE. That is one of the purposes of my remarks today, to see to it that the Appropriations Committee of this House will scrutinize every expenditure; not only that but investigate what lend-lease money has been spent for already.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is along the lines suggested by our colleague from New York [Mr. TABER] and our colleague from Ohio [Mr. JONES]?

Mr. McGEHEE. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGEHEE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I imagine the gentleman always felt as I did, that before lend-lease went into effect we should have had some arrangement with other countries and we should have been able to tell just exactly what they were going to do for us.

Mr. McGEHEE. My thought was when the first lend-lease bill was placed before this Congress, that it should have been in the form of loans to our Allied Governments rather than a lend-lease program. If they never repaid it, then we would know exactly what it was loaned to them for, and we could keep up with it then. As it is, my information is that there is being sent to our Allied countries every conceivable article that

they desire; that those articles are being purchased under lend-lease to be used after the war is over, thereby filling up their countries with the articles that our people are deprived of today in their necessary avocations.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGEHEE. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman from Mississippi is making a very interesting statement and a very thought-provoking one. I had occasion to examine the assessed valuation of the United States not long ago and I find it is about \$209,000,000,000. The figure that the gentleman gives us will be double the assessed valuation of the entire country at the end of this war. Does not the gentleman think that we are engaging in a wrong program when we are looking for subsidization of nearly every activity of the American people? I am thinking of a bill in another Chamber in this Capitol which will be taken up this week, looking for \$300,000,000 annually to subsidize education in this country. They want subsidies for the libraries of the country. Does not the gentleman think that is the wrong trend?

Mr. McGEHEE. I would rather not express myself at this moment on that broad question.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGEHEE. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I congratulate the gentleman on the statement he has made. I would like to point out something that is generally misunderstood in connection with the transfer to England of our lend-lease supplies, that that is not the end of the proposition. They have also increased the price of the things transferred, and have collected the original price plus a profit from the people to whom they have transferred. This has not been developed by the six Senators who have come back from foreign countries.

Mr. McGEHEE. If our Committee on Appropriations will go thoroughly into this matter there will be things revealed to the Congress and the people of the United States that will be most astounding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I think the Congress should at once repeal our lend-lease program and whatever sums that are necessary to furnish our allies should be loaned to them and the expenditure of it confined to those things necessary for the prosecution of the war. We are today spending under the lend-lease approximately one and a half billion dollars a month, or at the rate of eighteen to twenty billion a year, and all the war strategists predict the war will last 2 or 3 years more, hence, you can readily see what an enormous sum this

will amount to when already we have authorized and appropriated sixty billion for this one purpose.

We are told that much of this money is being spent and utilized by our Allied Nations for goods that the people of this country are being deprived of, when they are so necessary to carry on their proper avocations, or necessary equipment in their personal lives, which would not be done if the funds were loaned to them. Remember membership, in my opinion, none of these funds will ever be repaid.

The Appropriations Committee should scrutinize most closely the expenditures by the different agencies in the prosecution of the war. I am sure each Member has the information of the enormous surplus of certain materials that are being hoarded throughout the world for rehabilitation program that we should not participate in as a Santa Claus bringing gifts. There are those who are in key positions of our Government who advocate this world Utopia and daily in the furtherance of their plans, after the Congress appropriates the moneys, are carrying them out, thereby placing this burden on the 130,000,000 people of this country, when there are a billion souls involved, who certainly must have their part and share in world rehabilitation rather than enslave the people of these great United States.

The five Senators who have just made a global trip to all the battle fronts of the world, have only revealed those things that we knew already, but they have brought first-hand information and it is time for this Congress to wake up, and at least when they appropriate money again or levy more taxes on the people, know how the funds are going to be spent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed encouraging to find Members of the House and of the other body in Congress giving some scrutiny at least to the Lend-Lease Administration. On May 21, when we had the last \$6,000,000,000 appropriation before the Congress of the United States, I stood in the Well of this House and pleaded with the membership to scrutinize that appropriation. I thought then, and I think now, that every cent of that \$6,000,000,000 was for the purpose of maintaining the civilian economy of the United Nations, and particularly Great Britain. I do not think, even if our hearts urged us to do it, that 135,000,000 people can maintain the internal economy of 500,000,000 people and more of the British Empire. I do not think that our 135,000,000 people can maintain the internal economy of 457,000,000 Chinese and 170,000,000 Soviets. In other words, United States cannot maintain the internal economy for 1,127,000,000 people and fight a global war successfully without breaking up internally. You do not find any evidence

in the hearings or in the lend-lease reports that we are maintaining the civilian economies of the United Nations. The weasle-worded lend-lease reports hide all of this international W. P. A. program that the Lend-Lease Administration has started and Congress, in its innocence and trust, has been taken in. One splendid example of that is the lend-lease in reverse propaganda.

The lend-lease reports and the lend-lease idealists highlight the fact that lend-lease works both ways. Without citing the tonnages of our lend-lease, the lend-lease reports say that from June 1, 1942, to April 1, 1943. Great Britain shipped us 1,643,000 ship tons as lend-lease in reverse. When you are through reading lend-lease reports, you gain the impression that lend-lease in reverse is inexorably tied to our lend-lease program so we could not quit lend-leasing if we wanted to. However, when you examine the facts and discover the size of our shipments, the lend-lease in reverse theory is exploded like a bubble. From May 1, 1942, to May 1, 1943, we shipped 20,000,000 tons for our own Army to do the same thing that lend-lease does in addition to furnishing our own troops to man and expend them for the same purposes as lend-lease, to wit: To maintain the territorial integrity of our allies.

At the same time the Navy was shipping supplies to its forces at the rate of 8,538,051 long tons per year. This does not include our lend-lease tonnages but are merely the tonnages to supply and equip our own fighting forces.

While I do not have the lend-lease tonnages for the same period, for the first 6 months in this year lend-lease tonnages were 11,000,000 long tons. This would make a total tonnage of Army, Navy, and lend-lease at the rate of 50,000,000 tons a year. This would indicate that lend-lease to our allies and the supplies to our Army and Navy which will do the same immediate job—that is, maintaining the territorial integrity of our allies—represents a highway of 50 lanes flowing from the United States and 1 lane flowing to the United States as lend-lease in reverse.

Australia, Belgium, Fighting France, New Zealand, and Great Britain are the only nations having lend-lease in reverse agreements signed with us. According to my best estimates, the lend-lease highway that the political idealists talk about presents a picture of a broad highway of 51 lanes—50 in the direction of our allies and not more than 2 in our direction.

The United States, with a population of 135,000,000 people, is keeping 50 lanes full of supplies going to the fifty-odd battle fronts of the world, while the British Empire, with 500,000,000 people are maintaining 1 to 2 lanes of lend-lease in reverse.

Lend-lease working both ways by ship tonnages is an exploded theory. From sources very close to Lend-Lease Administration and from responsible officials, I learned that the cash value of lend-lease in reverse from all nations amounted to approximately \$800,000,000

in December 1942. This was \$60,000,000 less than Congress has given to the President for his secret war emergency funds. On a dollar valuation as of the first of this year, lend-lease in reverse is a mere bagatelle.

There is another way that lend-lease is working both ways. In England we are spending \$203,000,000 more for food shipments to England than England is paying in subsidies to freeze the price of food. The Lend-Lease Administration program of maintaining the civilian economies of the United Nations in the British case, operates against inflation, while in South America it tends to drive them into inflation. It is estimated that the United States, acting through many agencies of the Government, will spend \$2,000,000,000 in South America alone. We are making enormous expenditures for strategic materials, building highways through their swamp lands, and establishing rubber plantations, in addition to our industrialization program. The Army and Navy are spending money for permanent facilities there and charging them up to the Army and Navy appropriations, rather than lend-lease.

All these activities in South America for which we will pay the South American Republics in cash \$2,000,000,000, is driving them into inflation. The latest developments of Nelson Rockefeller's office, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, has been to advise the South American republics how to escape inflation.

The Lend Lease Act originally was intended for aid to those countries who were not able to buy equipment of war from us because they lacked credits or international exchange from which to purchase them from us.

The American republics present the absolute opposite picture, however; every one of them are listed among the 46 nations entitled to lend-lease. The entire lend-lease nations are as follows:

Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fighting France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Turkey, United Kingdom, U. S. S. R., Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

The Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1944, Public, No. 92, approved June 26, 1943, contains approximately \$552,000,000 justified for the United Nations. Of this amount, \$383,000,000 is justified under the appropriation "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships," \$12,000,000, or 3 percent, of which is for the American republics. On this basis, 3 percent of \$552,000,000, or approximately \$16,000,000 would be allotted to the American republics. The Army has a similar lend-lease program in which South America participates.

Lend-Lease Administration is not geared to the war; its transfers to other nations and its exports are in inverse proportion to the United States' vic-

tories. Most significantly it works both ways—the first way by preventing inflation in England by shipments of food and other civilian commodities whose values are higher than the subsidies paid by England to maintain her price levels, and the second way, lend-lease adds to the \$2,000,000,000 we are spending in cash in the American republics and hastening their threat of inflation.

Lend-lease appropriations to date are \$65,726,650,000, which is \$4,000,000,000 more than Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand have appropriated for their entire war effort from the beginning of hostilities—from the year 1939, the outbreak of the war. The appropriations by years for Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand are as follows:

	Great Britain	Canada	Australia	New Zealand
1939.....	\$5,355,917,748	\$100,000,000	\$42,664,811	\$3,240,000
1940.....	10,800,100,592	835,000,000	223,103,658	26,112,825
1941.....	14,636,019,480	1,435,000,000	2,002,600,000	116,626,239
1942.....	21,564,019,480	3,000,000,000	1,035,803,960	211,681,142
Total.....	52,356,117,300	5,370,000,000	3,303,677,430	357,660,207

¹ This figure also includes 1943.

The amount that we are furnishing to the other nations is underestimated because many people have not realized the change in conception of aid to our allies since Pearl Harbor. Oftentimes the newspapers discuss lend-lease in terms of round figures of \$25,000,000,000. This is merely the amount that has been appropriated to the President of the United States and is a portion of the fund that is principally used to maintain the civilian economies of our allies and is under the direct supervision of Edward Stettinius, Administrator of Lend Lease Administration.

Since the war, the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission have sought what they called defense aid limitations' on the funds appropriated in their own supply bills. The Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, and departments other than War have a total limitation on their appropriations of \$41,116,650,000. In addition to that, the Navy Department may lease ships without any dollar value limitation. The total appropriations in cash that are available for aid to our allies is \$65,700,000,000. As of December 31, 1942, the transfer of lend-lease goods and services was as follows:

United Kingdom.....	\$3,959,950,000
Australia, New Zealand, India, and other British Territories, Egypt.....	2,393,193,000
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.....	1,532,230,000
China.....	156,738,000
Other.....	210,622,000
Total.....	8,252,733,000

At that time I charged that lend-lease material was moving to territories in inverse proportion to the victories of the United Nations on the 50-odd battle fronts of the world.

The May 25, 1943, report of Lend-Lease Administrator Stettinius says:

In view of the global nature of the war, the name of the government to which goods are transferred does not necessarily indicate the battle front on which the goods will be used * * * hence, in considering aid by countries, the export figures give a better picture of the part played by lend-lease in various fronts of the war than do the figures on transfers. Table II shows the monthly total of lend-lease exports by countries.

I now quote from the cumulative total of table II, and I submit that the exports are still to countries in inverse propor-

tion to the victories of the United Nations. The totals are as follows:

United Kingdom.....	\$3,116,000,000
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.....	1,822,000,000
Africa and Middle East.....	1,000,000,000
China, India, Australia, New Zealand.....	875,000,000
Other.....	292,000,000

But lend-lease's own figures indicate the United Kingdom still gets one and seven-tenths times as much as Russia, and the latest figures for China alone show that England received over 700 times as much as China.

Lend-Lease Administration is not geared to the war. The enormous equipment and supplies for our troops in the various theaters of the war, for whom no one gets an accounting, of necessity are responsible for the gains we are making in the South Pacific, the victory of north Africa, Pantelleria, and Sicily. Wherever our American troops are fighting and throwing the weight of munitions and supplies purchased with the \$330,000,000,000 of appropriations of our Army and Navy in those places we are winning victories.

Neither lend-lease transfers nor exports show a direct relationship to the victories won by the United Nations.

The enormous sums transferred or exported to the United Kingdom are explained in part by the answer of Mr. Stettinius to one of 68 questions I submitted to him May 5. I quote the question:

39. In the December 31 report, at pages 36 and 37, there is a category in the table entitled "Australia, New Zealand, India, other British territories, Egypt" for expenditures of \$2,393,193,000. Will you please name the countries, territories, possessions, islands, or other political subdivisions represented by "other British territories" in this table?

Mr. Stettinius answered as follows:

In the table to which you refer the following are included under the category "Australia, New Zealand, India, other British territories, Egypt":

Aden, Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, Australia, Bahrain, Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, British East Africa, British Honduras, British Malaya, British Oceania, British South Africa, Burma, Canada,¹ Ceylon, Cyprus, Egypt, Falk-

¹ Lend-lease goods included in the table which have been transferred to Canada were for incorporation in articles furnished by Canada to the United Kingdom or to replace goods previously purchased by Canada and incorporated in such articles.

land Islands, Gambia and Sierra Leone, Gibraltar, Gold Coast, Hong Kong, India, Jamaica, Leeward Islands, Malta and Gozo, Mauritius, Newfoundland and Labrador, New Guinea, New Zealand, Nigeria, Palestine and Transjordan, Rhodesia, Trinidad and Tobago, Union of South Africa, Windward Islands, British forces in Iran and Iraq.

The United States is making a tremendous effort in the global war. Our armed forces are giving a splendid account of themselves wherever they have met the enemy. We will need every friend we can gain at the peace table and should have every ounce of good will earned by the sacrifice and devotion of our armed forces and civilian population on the fighting front, on the financial front, and the moral and spiritual front. We certainly should earn the good will of every island, nation, or territory who receive benefits from the United States. The admission of Mr. Stettinius that goods are transferred to these 56 nations by the British Empire shows conclusively that someone else is gaining the good will to which we are rightfully entitled. From Aden through the alphabet to the Windward Islands, the United States should deal with each one of these countries direct to earn friends for America. Lend-lease is losing them for us.

The hearings have never disclosed any of the material that the Senators now bring back to you. I must confess that this House was not impressed with information I gave you on May 21 and which the Senators have now confirmed. Perhaps you had more confidence in the statements made by the Administrator of Lend-Lease.

Here is a typical example of a question submitted to Mr. Stettinius by a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee:

Mr. SCHIFFLER. * * * Are any of the things that have been administered under lend-lease and shipped abroad being utilized or are they being used for commercial purposes by any of the nations receiving them?

Mr. STETTINIUS. Not unless they are filling an essential service in connection with the prosecution of the war. There might be a small number of replacement parts, spark plugs, that are finding their way into the civilian life of a country, but only if that is creating necessary transportation to munitions workers or for doctors or for air-raid wardens or something of the kind. I can assure you no spark plugs and no tires are being used for purposes of the civilian population in lend-lease countries that are not an essential purpose connected with the prosecution of the war.

Mr. Speaker, that answer is a falsehood, and if not known by Mr. Stettinius it certainly is no recommendation for him as Under Secretary of State. As a matter of fact, we ship all of the oil that the Navy can get in tankers for allocation to the north African theater of war. From the oil delivered to Africa, the Army and Navy make their requests and the balance is turned over to the country for consumption in private commercial channels. The government collects the money and enhances its treasury to that extent. In the British case, they retransfer our oil, collect the money from the transferee country, and stick the money in their treasury, in addition to earning the good will. This I told you on May 21.

This explains why lend-lease allocations, transfers, and deliveries have been made to countries in inverse proportion to where our victories are won, as I warned you on March 10. There is great clamor now to hear the Senators in executive session, in off-the-record occasions. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I maintain that our officials in the Lend-Lease Administration and in other Government agencies and even the President, himself, should deal with this Congress above the boards. We should not have to wait until our toil, sweat, and tears are dissipated for the internal economy of our allies before we can get the truth confirmed by Senators.

Now, at this late hour, after we have appropriated \$65,500,000,000, after the Senators have made a 40,000-mile trip around the globe, Congress begins to look into it. But it was our responsibility before we voted the money to limit its uses to military items. Within the next 2 or 3 days I am going to introduce a bill to recover back into the Federal Treasury money that is scheduled for nonmilitary items, gifts, and services. I will present a bill to abolish the Lend-Lease Administration and limit aid to our allies to military items.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Ohio need have no regrets about the waste of this money. I recall very distinctly when, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, not only on the floor of the House, but in the lobbies as well, he protested most vigorously against what he saw coming and prophesied what would happen, and what he prophesied has happened and it has been working out just as he predicted, and I remember how the gentleman from Ohio was criticized very severely by other Members because he objected to the program of lend-lease when he was advocating that the money should be spent by the Army and the Navy for equipping our forces, and should not be used and expended under Harry Hopkins and others to create a sort of a world-wide W. P. A.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I want to call your attention to the fact that when I submitted 68 questions to Mr. Stettinius about lend-lease there arose a great deal of criticism on and off the floor against your colleague. The answers to those questions were not given to any Member of Congress until the majority leader, in the heat of debate, said he would get the answers to me. Two months later I got the answers to the questions. And, to this date, it has not begun to permeate the country how big is the job of getting lend-lease facts. It is a job that requires personnel and the hard work of every individual Member of Congress, in the interest of our country. Certainly, it is entirely too big to be located in the files of one Member of Congress and analyzed by a few for the membership of Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, the gentleman will join with me in praying to the good

Lord, that since the Republicans alone cannot do it, we hope that we will be joined in this effort by the Democrats.

Mr. JONES. I sincerely do.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has rendered a valuable service throughout the months in sincere effort, both as a Member of the House and as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I would like to ask him this question: Why is it that the majority leadership on the Appropriations Committee usually brings in a bill that provides funds not only for the regular establishments, but ties these lend-lease funds in the same bill so that the Members of Congress, if we are not satisfied with the showing that the committee has made, cannot vote against the funds so provided without voting against the entire bill? Why is that always done?

Mr. JONES. I was inclined to make the same criticism, but it is a criticism that cannot now be made. This same House by an overwhelming majority—there were only five votes against—voted for this last \$6,000,000,000 appropriation for Lend-Lease Administration. It was a bill for Lend-Lease Administration and Lend-Lease Administration alone. It did not provide money for the army or the navy of our allies; it was purely for the civilian economy of the nations of the world and that was the sole question that was put to us on May 21, 1943.

What was the House's attitude toward disclosures similar to those now made by the Senators? Instead of a reaction to get at the facts, instead of listening to warnings of abuse by Lend-Lease Administration, you will remember several Members took the floor and accused me of making a personal attack upon the Lend-Lease Administrator. The House clearly missed the boat.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not only that but the gentleman was accused of hindering the war effort, of being disloyal and unpatriotic. The gentleman told them that some of the money would be wasted but he had no idea, I believe, that the expenses of Eleanor's trip and Willkie's trip throughout the world were going to be financed with the taxpayers' money.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 755. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, so as to give protection to persons in military service, and their dependents, as to certain mortgages.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 47 minutes) the House

adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

The Committee on Pensions will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 10 a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 2350. A bill to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents.

H. R. 2784. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, to certain maimed soldiers, to certain widows, minor children, and helpless children of such soldiers and sailors, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1926.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, for consideration of H. R. 2909 and H. R. 3306.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 10 a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 3257. A bill to amend subtitle—insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The purposes of the bill is to affirm and clarify the authority of the W. S. A. to agree to a waiver of the statute of limitations in connection with claims arising from insurance agreements in case of missing vessels, in order to provide for prompt settlement of both marine risks and war risks involved.

H. R. 3258. A bill to prevent double recovery on claims under section 1 (a) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to seamen employed by the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to limit the possibility of double or overlapping recovery on account of death or injury of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the W. S. A. The possibility of such overlapping recovery arises in cases of seamen who are entitled to sue under the law of the United States in case of death or injury and may also be entitled to sue under foreign law on account of the same casualty.

H. R. 3259. A bill to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to exclude from consideration for the purposes of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, services of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the

W. S. A. on foreign-flag vessels or contracted for and performed wholly outside the United States, so that the coverage for such benefits for seamen employees of the W. S. A. shall be in line with the coverage in case of similar services by seamen employed by private shipping operators.

H. R. 3260. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for requisition or purchase of vessels owned by subsidiaries of American corporations.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the requisition or purchase under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, of vessels owned by American concerns through foreign subsidiaries but which are not owned by United States citizens within the terms of the Merchant Marine Act and which are not idle foreign vessels within the terms of the act of June 6, 1941.—Public, No. 101, Seventy-seventh Congress.

H. R. 3261. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is, by amending Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress, to authorize the return of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less which are owned by the United States under the procedure of Public Law 44 for the return to private ownership of vessels to which the United States has title which are no longer needed in the war effort.

H. R. 3262. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to expressly authorize the waiver of recovery of seamen's insurance payments by the W. S. A. particularly in cases where insurance has been paid to beneficiaries on the assumption that the missing seamen were dead, but later are found to be alive. The bill follows a similar provision with respect to recovery of benefits paid by the Veterans' Administration.

H. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The purpose of the resolution is to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy similar to that provided for the United States Coast Guard Academy.

H. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

The purpose of the resolution is to authorize the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration to pay cash awards for suggestions received from employees to increase efficiency or improve the functioning of the agencies.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 3334, to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold a hearing on H. R. 2994, Wednesday, October 13, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 416 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

831. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

832. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Investigation and Research, transmitting its estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

833. A letter from the Administrative Officer, Office for Emergency Management, President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, quarterly estimate of personnel requirements covering the quarter ending December 31, 1943, of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

834. A letter from E. G. Allen, rear admiral, United States Navy, Director of Budget and Reports, transmitting report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of service, with special qualifications thereof, of each person commissioned from civilian life in the Navy from July 30, 1943, to September 29, 1943, and in the Marine Corps and Coast Guard from August 1, 1943, to September 30, 1943; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

835. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting two proposed provisions affecting existing appropriations of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1944 (H. Doc. No. 334); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

836. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the appropriation for the Office of Defense Transportation, Office for Emergency Management, fiscal year 1944 (H. Doc. No. 335); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

837. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of the information which has been submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for his use in determining the number of employees required by the Department of State during the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, part 2, minority views on H. R. 3070. A bill to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act, to establish quotas, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 732). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1113. An act to amend section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 737). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1132. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, so as to provide for the payment of a uniform gratuity to certain officers recalled to active duty; without amendment (Rept. No. 738). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1170. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, of a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 739). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 2976. A bill to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 740). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 3223. A bill to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service; with amendment (Rept. No. 741). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DREWRY: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 3224. A bill to establish the grades of commissioned warrant officer and warrant officer in the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 742). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 3225. A bill to amend the act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; with amendment (Rept. No. 743). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 3230. A bill to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942; with amendment (Rept. No. 744). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2924. A bill to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada; to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 746). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 3377. A bill to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from \$40 to \$50 per month, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 747). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 3176. A bill to regulate the furnishing of artificial limbs or other appliances to retired officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard and to certain civilian employees of the military and naval forces of the Regular Establishment; with amendment (Rept. No. 748). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 3356. A bill to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 749). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 964. An act to pro-

vide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation; without amendment (Rept. No. 750). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3418. A bill to provide for promotion of certain American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 3419. A bill to continue the pay of all persons serving in the armed forces of the United States for 1 year after the termination of the present conflict; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 3420. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 3421. A bill to amend section 408 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, relating to consolidations, mergers, and acquisitions of control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3422. A bill to increase the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy allowed for Delegates in Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3423. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy allowed for Delegates in Congress; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3424. A bill to authorize payments in lieu of taxes to States and political subdivisions thereof in which real property has been acquired by the United States for military purposes, Indian lands, wildlife refuges, national forests, and national parks; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HARNES of Indiana:

H. R. 3425. A bill redefining sea duty and duty beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska in the case of residents of Territories and possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 3426. A bill to clarify and define the constitutional rights of retired personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3427. A bill to provide dispensary treatment and hospitalization in Army and Navy hospitals for retired enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 3428. A bill to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 3429. A bill to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution to establish a balanced nondefense National Budget; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution to welcome the people of Italy to the family of liberated nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 316. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate operations under an act to promote the defense of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 317. Resolution to provide for expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 316; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BUTLER:

H. Res. 318. Resolution to investigate the cause for the numerous fatal accidents in the military flying forces of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 319. Resolution inviting Senators RUSSELL, CHANDLER, MEAD, LODGE, and BREWSTER to address the House of Representatives in executive session; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. Res. 320. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to investigate the price paid and received by and the profits of wholesalers and other handlers of food; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 3430. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hazel Stutte; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H. R. 3431. A bill for the relief of the Home Insurance Co. of New York; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCGREGOR:

H. R. 3432. A bill for the relief of Thomas E. Schacher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3433. A bill for the relief of Isa H. Yunker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TIBBOTT:

H. R. 3434. A bill for the relief of Joseph Mrak; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2763. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. O. G. Harmon and others of Mountain Grove and Wright County, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2764. By Mr. FISH: Petition of Mrs. H. Peterson, of Newburgh, N. Y., and 33 other residents of that city urging the early consideration and favorable vote on the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) in order to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the present war, to reduce absenteeism, increase production, and eliminate sources of disorder and physical disability which are hampering our war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2765. Also, petition of Mrs. William M. Millen and 34 residents of Swan Lake and Sullivan County, N. Y., appealing for the enactment of House bill 2082, and contending that by its enactment untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2766. Also, petition of Florence B. Mallory, of Pine Bush, Orange County, N. Y., and 39 residents of Pine Bush, N. Y., requesting Congress to pass House bill 2082, introduced by Representative JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, in order to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by the prohibition of the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination or demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2767. Also, petition of Alfred B. Helsner, of Beacon, N. Y., and 34 other residents of Dutchess County, N. Y., urging early consideration and a favorable vote on the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) in order to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war, to reduce absenteeism, increase production, and eliminate sources of disorder and physical disability which are hampering our war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2768. Also, petition of Mildred Browning and 45 other residents of Hyde Park, Dutchess County, N. Y., protesting against the wastage of sugar and grains in the manufacture of beer, wines, and distilled liquors, contending that the use of these beverages jeopardizes the efficiency, morale, and safety of all our people, and advocating legislation to prevent such waste; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2769. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition of Elmer G. Huch and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2770. Also, petition of Harry J. Fields and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2771. Also, petition of Carl C. Cook and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2772. Also, petition of Eugene Bauer and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2773. Also, petition of Al. Becker's Market and 40 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2774. Also, petition of Fred J. Eggeman and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2775. Also, petition of Bruce J. Strode and 43 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2776. Also, petition of Edward Harder and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2777. Also, petition of George Gable and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2778. Also, petition of Fred Saettelle and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any

enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2779. Also, petition of Moses Aaron Teitelbaum and 320 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2780. Also, petition of Louis Amelung and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2781. By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of Evangelist E. L. Banta and 10,533 sundry citizens of the counties of Sangamon, Christian, Macoupin, and Montgomery in the Twenty-first Congressional District of Illinois, urging Congress to use its influence to improve conditions in the vicinity of Army camps in connection with the sale of intoxicants and the presence of vice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2782. Also, petition of Mrs. Margaret Schwass and 20 citizens of Elmhurst, Ill., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2783. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of milk producers of southern Berkshire County, Mass., opposing a subsidy on milk; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2784. By Mr. RAMEY: Petition of Daisy Meachen and 12 other residents of Lakeside, Ottawa County, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, sponsored by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2785. Also, petition of Mrs. C. B. Harmon and 50 other residents of Lucas County, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, sponsored by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2786. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the Atlanta Coast Line Railroad of Washington, D. C., and signed by 19 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2787. Also, petition of N. H. Brown, of Washington, D. C., and 19 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2788. Also, petition of Capt. Tom's Restaurant, of Washington, D. C., and signed by 20 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2789. Also, petition of the 400 Restaurant, of Washington, D. C., and signed by eight citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2790. Also, petition of the P. & N. Restaurant, of Washington, D. C., and signed by 58 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2791. Also, petition of the Westinghouse Electric Supply Co. and signed by 22 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2792. Also, petition of the Brass & Copper Sales Co. and signed by 24 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2793. Also, petition of Joseph H. Muckholz and 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against

the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2794. Also, petition of the Tobacco Workers' International Union, Local No. 200, and signed by 132 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2795. Also, petition of the Chemical Workers' Union, Local No. 21536, and signed by 57 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2796. Also, petition of Rose Koby and 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2797. Also, petition of the International Longshoremen's Association and signed by 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2798. Also, petition of Joseph J. Langen and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2799. Also, petition of Ruth Rogers and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2800. Also, petition of Angelo Oldani and 22 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2801. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Mrs. Robert W. Keller, of Raymond, Wash., urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), in order to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war, to reduce absenteeism, increase production, and eliminate sources of disorder and physical disability which are hampering our war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2802. Also, petition of Mrs. Lantz Wiss, of Shelton, Wash., and 57 other citizens of Shelton and vicinity, urging passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2803. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of Mrs. Bill Collins, of Navarro, Tex., favoring House bill 2350; to the Committee on Pensions.

2804. By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of Vincent Jacobs, secretary of the Staunton Trades Council, Staunton, Ill., and sundry citizens of the Twenty-first Congressional District of Illinois, protesting against the overriding, by Congress, of the President's veto of the Smith-Connally bill, and protesting against the congressional ban on subsidies in connection with the roll-back of prices on food and other items to the levels of September 18, 1942 and urging Congress to support an extensive program of subsidies to effect such a roll-back; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of the nations, on this day of national honor we give Thee thanks for the daring faith of that intrepid mariner who, trusting in Divine guidance, gained a New World for Thy benign purposes on the earth. From fragile ships tossing on